

UC-NRLF



QB 489 558





John Eustace Yubbe.

Tampnets. Roman Catholic question
"



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



Cardinal Wiseman.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION:

A COPIOUS SERIES

OF

IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS, OF PERMANENT
HISTORICAL INTEREST,

ON THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE

CATHOLIC HIERARCHY

IN ENGLAND, 1850-1.

LONDON:

JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

Price Four Shillings bound in cloth.

BX885

P33

v. 1



Proof Impressions of the Portrait, with autograph specimen of writing and
emblematical and ornamental borders, may be had, printed in a large 4to size,
price 4d.; or in imperial folio, beautifully printed in gold and tints, price 1s.

NO. 1111
AMERICAN

INTRODUCTION AND CONCLUSION.

THE Editor of the series of pamphlets on the Roman Catholic Question, in bringing his labours to a conclusion, cannot refrain from making a few reflections on the present aspects and prospects of the interests involved in the contest which has shaken the kingdom from its propriety, and well-nigh put in jeopardy the progress of its constitutional government. The Editor, however, deems it necessary to state, for the first time, that he is, from long ancestral descent, a Protestant; he was born, baptised, and educated in the Established Church, and amidst his very numerous relatives he does not remember a single instance of a contrary character; thus much for the Editor's predilections as to education and relative associations.

In reference to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius the Ninth, and the Pastoral of Cardinal Wiseman, the Editor feels there are expressions which, to a Protestant influenced by a prescribed form of educational notions as to Christian observances and principles, are naturally calculated, if viewed through a civil and political aspect, to offend his opinions and excite his prejudices. Still the Editor feels that if these documents had been treated in the sense they were, to his judgment, evidently intended to be by the authors, strictly in a spiritual sense and applied to the members of the Roman Catholic Church in our common country, the agitation which has unhappily existed for so lengthened a period would never have arisen.

He must express his conviction that the letter of Lord John Russell to the Bishop of Durham was a most unfortunate document to emanate from the First Minister of the Crown of these Realms—from one who, in his civil and political position, should have felt the necessity of his being, under any circumstances, an impartial observer of events, and who was bound in duty to his Sovereign as well as his countrymen to refrain from leading the Protestant portion of the kingdom into direct antagonism and uncharitable contrast with a third of the subjects of our beloved Queen. His lordship's letter appears the more marvellous when it is viewed as emanating from one who, ever since his first entrance upon the stage of political life, has been considered a sincere advocate of civil and religious liberty. It is lamentable to reflect how he has tarnished all his former laurels, and, it is to be feared, to a considerable extent destroyed his future usefulness as a member of the Legislature. It is not too much to assert, that the greater portion of the excitement has had its origin in this letter; and, however just the noble lord might at the time have considered his reflections, the Editor must assert his conviction, that the author of it must now regret its publication; at a period, too, when we, as a nation, are inviting people of all climes and of every variety of creed to visit our shores in generous emulation and fraternal harmony—how much more strange and ungenerous must such a letter appear!

The Editor does not feel inclined, neither is he qualified, to enter at any length into the religious arguments of the question, still he feels assured that the benign precepts of Christianity have been lamentably violated during the unfortunate agitation. It is painful to reflect upon the uncharitable reflections and arguments which have been enunciated from platform and pulpit, and though

all have not emulated the exciting zeal and anti-Christian denunciations of the Rev. Drs. Cumming and McNeile, still it must be a source of sorrow to every true patriot and sincere Christian that so much uncharitableness has been rife in our beloved country during this agitation. The reasoning faculties appear to have been almost deluged amidst the excitement of the question, whether viewed in a civil or religious sense. Our Catholic neighbours have not only been treated with great contumely by the members of the Established Church, but, strange to say, the Dissenters from our Church who, humanly speaking, owe all the civil and religious liberties which they now enjoy to former assistance generously rendered to them by the Catholic portion of the inhabitants of the kingdom, even these very Dissenters have taken a prominent part against the Catholics in the agitation; this, too, in the teeth of the fact that, if their present civil or religious liberties were put in jeopardy, the Catholic body would again come to their assistance and rescue.

The Editor has felt some consolation in his onerous labours at the kindly feeling which has been so frequently shown him by members of the different religious persuasions with whom, in the performance of his duties, he has come in contact; and in taking leave of his readers he cannot help impressing upon them the importance of their endeavouring to turn to their individual profit the arguments, good and bad though they may to some extent be, which have been advanced on the occasion. For himself he can truly say, that the vast correspondence which his duties have brought before him have tended to make him think more seriously than heretofore of the two principal religious systems in this land, the Established and Catholic Churches: they both, doubtless, have their human defects; but perhaps he may be permitted to say, that the Established Church of these realms, possessing, as it does, much more temporal wealth than any other Church in the world, ought to turn the present agitation to the consideration whether they might not be the means of far more usefulness, as to morals and religion, than they now are, and whether the poor and maligned Catholic Church in this land does not appear to care more efficiently for the spiritual and temporal comfort of the people committed to its charge than its rich and powerful rival does for its members. The documents and facts which have for the last four months emanated from the bishops and clergy of the rival Churches have had a striking tendency to lead the popular mind to think more favourably than heretofore of the Catholic—though in many senses the reverse should surely be the effect.

Finally, the Editor sincerely trusts that the recent agitation may rapidly subside, and leave as its fruits for the present and future generations a decided and efficient conviction of our duties as a Christian community, and that each and all may endeavour to put into more practical operation the benign precepts of our Lord and Saviour; and in choosing the communion of our adoption in this world, may select that one which tends to bring us the most completely in contact with the anticipated regions of future and eternal bliss.

NOTE.—The Editor deems it necessary to state his conviction that all the important facts and documents relative to the "Roman Catholic Question" have appeared in the pages of these pamphlets. Doubtless during the progress of the Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill through the Houses of Parliament many speeches of interest will be made; still the Editor thinks they will, to a considerable extent, be merely elaborations of the materials already in these pages, devoid of original facts or documents. Should, however, on the conclusion of the debates, the Editor's opinions undergo a change, he will issue the results in the form of an Appendix to the present volume.

I N D E X.

[The abbreviations have reference to the Series of the Pamphlet in which the article is to be found, and the page of such Series, thus—Bangor, on the “Romish Aggression,” *Series 8, Page 7.*]

- ABERDEEN**, Earl of, Speech in the House of Lords on the Ministerial Crisis, *s. 24, p. 1*
Abbey of Westminster, particulars as to its foundation and dedication, *s. 1, p. 15*
Address to the Queen by the English Catholics, *s. 4, p. 15*
 — to the Queen from the Bishops of the Established Church, *s. 10, p. 16*
 — from the Catholics of Birmingham, *s. 6, p. 9-11*
 — to the Crown, from the City of London, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, *s. 11, p. 1-7*
 — from Irish Bishops to their flocks, *s. 24, p. 11-13*
 — to Cardinal Wiseman, *s. 15, p. 11, 12*
Aggression, alleged, of the Pope, by an Irish Beneficed Clergyman, *s. 15, p. 13-15*
 — Papal, and “What’s it all about?” an article from “*Tait’s Magazine*,” *s. 16, p. 1-8*
Agitation, the Protestant, by Carolus, *s. 11, p. 11-14*
Anstey, Mr. C., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons, *s. 18, p. 12, 13, and s. 22, p. 7, 8*
Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX., *s. 1, p. 1-4*
Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the People of England. By Cardinal Wiseman, *s. 5, p. 1-12*
Arundel and Surrey, Earl of, M.P., Speech in the House of Commons, *s. 18, p. 13*
Asaph, Bishop of St., and Lord Feilding, *s. 3, p. 10-13*
 — on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 8, p. 5, 6*
Ashley, Lord, M.P., Speech by, *s. 20, p. 14-16*
 — *s. 21, p. 1-3*
Assumption of Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, *s. 23, p. 15, 16*
Atlas on Cardinal Wiseman’s Appeal, *s. 7, p. 1, 2*
Attorney-General, Speech by the, *s. 20, p. 11-14*
Bangor, the Bishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 8, p. 7*
 “**Bateh of Bishops**,” an article on the, from the *Weekly Dispatch*, *s. 1, p. 9-10*
Bath and Wells, Bishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 7, p. 15, 16*
Beaumont’s, Lord, Letter to Lord Zetland, with reply by G. Bowyer, Esq., *s. 11, p. 15, 16*
Benedictine Monks and King Edward the Confessor, *s. 1, p. 15*
Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., Letter to Lord John Russell, *s. 9, p. 3-13*
 — Resignation of, *s. 11, p. 7-11*
 — Correspondence with the Bishop of London, *s. 12, p. 1-10*
Bill to prevent the Assumption of Ecclesiastical Titles, *s. 23, p. 15, 16, and s. 24, p. 16*
 — Legal Arguments at length on the, by Vincent Scully, *s. 24, p. 7-11.*
 — Historical and Practical Opinions thereon, by Serjeant Stree, *s. 24, p. 14-16*
Birmingham, Catholic Bishop of, Letters to the *Times*, *s. 1, p. 6, 7*
 — Letter to Lord John Russell, *s. 19, p. 15, 16*
 — Address from the Catholics of, *s. 6, p. 9-11.*
Bishops of the Established Church, Address to the Queen from the, *s. 10, p. 16*
 — Correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Exeter and St. David’s relative thereto, *s. 13, p. 1-7*
 — Cardinal Wiseman’s Lecture on the Hierarchy, and in respect to this Address, *s. 13, p. 7-10*
Bowyer, George, Esq., Replies to Dr. Cumming’s Charges against Cardinal Wiseman, *s. 10, p. 11-16*
 — Reply to Lord Beaumont, *s. 11, p. 15, 16*
 — Letter on the Papal Rescript, *s. 14, p. 10, 11*
Bright, J., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s. 20, p. 3-6*
Briscoe, the Rev. Dr., and Lord Feilding, *s. 3, p. 11*
Bristol, Speeches by the Dean of, *s. 4, p. 10-15*
Brotherton, J., M.P., Speech by, *s. 23, p. 14*
Bruce, C., M.P., Speech by, *s. 23, p. 11, 12*
Cambridge University, Address to Crown, *s. 11, p. 1-7*
Canoyes, Lord, Speech in House of Lords, *s. 18, p. 4, 5*
Canterbury, the Lord Archbishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 7, p. 12*
 — Letter from Sir B. Hall to the, *s. 9, p. 13-16*
 — Bishop of Exeter and St. David’s correspondence in reference to the Bishops’ Address to the Queen, *s. 13, p. 1-7*
 — Reply to the Address from the Episcopal Church of Scotland, *s. 13, p. 16*
 — Remonstrance of the Irish Prelates, *s. 16, p. 16*
C. G., Observations on the Queen’s Spiritual Supremacy, *s. 15, p. 15, 16*
Cardinal Wiseman’s Pastoral, *s. 1, p. 4-6*
 — Loyalty and Patriotism, *s. 1, p. 11*
 — Birth and Education, *s. 1, p. 13, 14*
 — Mother, *s. 17, p. 14-16*
 — Oath, From the *Spectator* newspaper, *s. 7, p. 11*
Carlisle, the Bishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 14, p. 12, 13*
 “**Carolus**” on the Protestant Agitation, *s. 11, p. 11-14*
Catholic, a, explanation of the Papal Aggression, *s. 6, p. 11-13*
 “**Catholicus**” on the Prayer for the Queen, Bishop Ullathorne’s Letter thereon, *s. 1, p. 7, 8*
Charge, the, of the Bishop of London, at St. Paul’s Cathedral, *s. 2, p. 1-13*
Chester, Bishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 8, p. 6*
Chichester, Bishop of, on the “Romish Aggression,” *s. 8, p. 4*
Church, State, and People, *s. 14, p. 1-5.*
Church of England, Rev. G. A. Denison on the Real Danger of the, *s. 1, p. 12*
Churches, the Established and Catholic, lashed to each other, *s. 3, p. 8*
Clarke, Mr. Rochford, his Attack on Cardinal Wiseman’s Mother, *s. 17, p. 14-16*
Confessional, the Catholic, Dr. McNeile’s Strictures on the, *s. 13, p. 10-12*
Conolly, T., M.P., Speech of, *s. 21, p. 5*
Conversion of the Rev. H. W. Witherforce, *s. 6, p. 15, 16*
 — Rev., of England to the Catholic Faith, said to be predicted by King Edward the Confessor, *s. 1, p. 15*
Correspondence between the Bishops of Exeter and St. David’s with the Archbishop of Canterbury, *s. 13, p. 1-7*
 — between the Bishop of London and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, *s. 13, p. 1-7*
Cremerne, Lord, Speech in the House of Lords, on seconding the Address to her Majesty, *s. 18, p. 2*
Crisis, Ministerial, Speeches on the, *s. 24, p. 1-7*
Cumming’s, Rev. Dr., Lecture on the Hierarchy and Cardinal Wiseman’s Teaching, *s. 2, p. 13-16*
 — his Reflections on the Contest, with some Contrasts, *s. 3, p. 7*
 — Lecture on the Cardinal’s Oath, *s. 6, p. 1-7*
 — Letters on the Cardinal’s Oath, with Replies by G. Bowyer, *s. 10, p. 11-16*
 — Letter to Mr. Bowyer on Cardinal Wiseman, *s. 14, p. 9, 10*
Daily News, the, on Cardinal Wiseman’s “Appeal,” *s. 5, p. 14*
 — a Leading Article from the, on *Premunire*, *s. 6, p. 13, 14*
 — on the University and City Addresses, *s. 11, p. 7*

- David's, Bishop of St., on the "Romish Aggression," *s.* 8, *p.* 9, 10
 — Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, *s.* 13, *p.* 7
- Denison, Rev. G. A., on the folly of the Protestant Agitation, *s.* 1, *p.* 11, 12
 — on the Real Danger of the Church of England, *s.* 1, *p.* 12
- Disraeli, Benjamin, M.P., Letter of, on the "Papal Aggression," *s.* 1, *p.* 12, 13
 — Speech by, *s.* 20, *p.* 6-9
- Doyle, Rev. Dr., Sermon of, at St. George's Catholic Cathedral, *s.* 8, *p.* 12-14
- Drummond, H., M.P., Speech of, in the House of Commons, *s.* 19, *p.* 13, 14, and ditto, *s.* 21, *p.* 4
- Durham, Lord John Russell's Letter to the Bishop of, *s.* 1, *p.* 8
 — Dr. Cumming's Remarks on, *s.* 2, *p.* 14
 — Bishop of, on "Romish Aggression," *s.* 7, *p.* 16
- Duke, Sir J., M.P., Speech of, *s.* 23, *p.* 3, 4
 — Irish Catholic Bishops' Address to their Flocks on the, *s.* 24, *p.* 11-13
- Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill, *s.* 23, *p.* 15, 16, and *s.* 24, *p.* 16
 — Serjeant Shee's Speech on the, *s.* 24, *p.* 14-16
- Editorial Remarks on Dr. Cumming's Second Lecture and the Influences at work in the "Agitation," *s.* 6, *p.* 7, 8
 — in reference to Original Articles, *s.* 9, *p.* 1
 — in reference to the Permanent Interest of the Series of Pamphlets, *s.* 12, *p.* 1
 — on the unchristian spirit displayed by the Rev. H. McNeile in his impassioned zeal, *s.* 13, *p.* 12, 13
 — on Messrs. Richardson's unjustifiable proceedings, *s.* 18, *p.* 1
- Editha, Queen of King Edward the Confessor, assisting at the Dedication of the Abbey of Westminster, *s.* 1, *p.* 15
- Edward, King and Confessor, Anecdote and Vision of, *s.* 1, *p.* 15
 — his Burial in Westminster Abbey (which he founded) a few days after its Dedication, *s.* 1, *p.* 15
- Elfringham, Earl, Speech in the House of Lords on moving the Address to her Majesty, *s.* 18, *p.* 2
- Elliott, Dr. Gilbert, Speeches of, at Bristol, *s.* 4, *p.* 10-15
- England, Appeal to the People of, by Cardinal Wiseman, *s.* 5, *p.* 1-12
- England, Re-conversion of, to the Catholic Faith, said to be predicted by King Edward the Confessor, *s.* 1, *p.* 15
- Episcopal Church of Scotland, Address from the, to the Bishops of the Established Church, *s.* 13, *p.* 15, 16
- Established Church, Bishops of the, Address to the Queen, *s.* 10, *p.* 16
- Examiner newspaper on Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal, *s.* 7, *p.* 4, 5
- Exeter, the Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," *s.* 7, *p.* 14, 15
 — Correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in reference to the Bishops' Address to the Queen, *s.* 13, *p.* 1-7
- Fagan, W., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons, *s.* 18, *p.* 13, and ditto, *s.* 22, *p.* 13-16
- Feilding, Lord, and the Bishop of St. Asaph, *s.* 3, *p.* 10-13
- "Few Words to the Men of England," *s.* 8, *p.* 15, 16
 "Few more Words to Englishmen," *s.* 14, *p.* 14-16
- Fitz-Patrick, Felix, reply to R. Clarke's attack on Cardinal Wiseman's Mother, *s.* 17, *p.* 16
- "G.," a letter to the *Times* on Cardinal Wiseman's Loyalty and Patriotism, *s.* 1, *p.* 11
- "G. C.," Observations by, on the Queen's Spiritual Supremacy, *s.* 15, *p.* 15, 16
- Gibson, Milner, M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 23, *p.* 8-11
- Gloucester, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," *s.* 8, *p.* 3
- Graham, Sir J., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons on the Ministerial Crisis by, *s.* 24, *p.* 1-7
- Grattan, H., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 18, *p.* 13, 14, and ditto, *s.* 21, *p.* 3, 4
- Grey, Sir G., M.P., Speech by, *s.* 21, *p.* 10-16
- Guardian newspaper, its opinion of the Duke of Norfolk's Letter, *s.* 12, *p.* 10
- "Guys," Processions of, and Burning of Effigies, their evil tendencies, *s.* 6, *p.* 7, 8
- Hall, Sir B., M.P., Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury by, *s.* 9, *p.* 13-16
- Hamilton, G. A., M.P., Speech by, *s.* 23, *p.* 5, 6
- Harcourt, Admiral, his Speech, *s.* 2, *p.* 13, and *s.* 6, *p.* 1
- Haves, Benjamin, M.P., his testimony in favour of Cardinal Wiseman, *s.* 3, *p.* 8
- Hereford, the Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," *s.* 14, *p.* 12
- Hexham, Pastoral by the Catholic Bishop of, *s.* 12, *p.* 13-15
- Hierarchy, Bishop Ullathorne on the, *s.* 1, *p.* 6, 7
 — Rev. G. A. Denison, questioning the opposition to its establishment, *s.* 1, *p.* 11, 12
 — Hume, Joseph, M.P., on the, *s.* 8, *p.* 1
 — Willerforce, Areldaecon, on the, *s.* 8, *p.* 8
 — Roebuck, J. A., M.P., on the, *s.* 9, *p.* 1-3
 — a Plain Appeal on the, by John Bull, *s.* 4, *p.* 1-10
 — Card. Wiseman's Lecture on the, *s.* 10, *p.* 5-11
 — Ditto, and in reference to the Address of the Bishops of the Established Church, and the Duties of the Catholic Church, *s.* 13, *p.* 7-10
 — Irish Beneficed Clergyman's Opinions on the, *s.* 15, *p.* 13-15
 — Bishop Ullathorne's Account of the Origin of the New, in a Letter to Lord John Russell, *s.* 19, *p.* 15, 16
- Hope, H. T., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 18, *p.* 10-12, and ditto, *s.* 22, *p.* 9
- Howard, P. H., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 21, *p.* 16, and ditto, *s.* 22, *p.* 1, 2
- Hume, Joseph, M.P., on the Catholic Hierarchy, *s.* 8, *p.* 1
 — Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 18, *p.* 13, and ditto *s.* 22, *p.* 10, 11
- Illustrated London News on Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal, *s.* 7, *n.* 8-10
- Immoral and blasphemous tendencies of the Procession of "Guys" and the Burning of Effigies, *s.* 6, *p.* 7, 8
- Inglis, Sir R., M.P., Speech of, *s.* 18, *p.* 10, and ditto, *s.* 20, *p.* 8, 9
- Irish Beneficed Clergyman, an, on the alleged "Papal Aggression," *s.* 15, *p.* 13-15
 — Established Prelates, Remonstrance of the, to the Archbishop of Canterbury; with answer, *s.* 16, *p.* 16
 — Catholic Bishops' Address to their Flocks on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, *s.* 24, *p.* 11-13
- John Bull's Plain Appeal to the People of England on the New Catholic Hierarchy, *s.* 4, *p.* 1-10
- Keogh, W., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, *s.* 22, *p.* 4-7
- Kildare, Marquis of, Speech on moving the Address to the Queen in House of Commons, *s.* 18, *p.* 6
- Lansdowne, Marquis of, Speech in the House of Lords, *s.* 18, *p.* 5, 6
- Langdale, Hon. C., on the Roman Catholics and Lord John Russell, *s.* 6, *p.* 8, 9
- Leader newspaper on Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal, *s.* 7, *p.* 3
- Leading Articles from the Public Press on Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal to the People of England, *s.* 4, 5, 7
- Lecture by Dr. Cumming on the Hierarchy, *s.* 2, *p.* 13-16
 — on the Cardinal's Oath, *s.* 6, *p.* 1-7

- Lecture by the Rev. T. Nolan on the "Pope and the Queen," s. 3, p. 1-6
- by Henry Vincent on the Pope, the Bishops, and the People, s. 15, p. 1-10
- Legal, Historical, and Practical Speech on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, by Serj. Shee, s. 24, p. 14-16
- Legal Arguments on the Ecclesiastical Assumption Titles Bill, by V. Scully, s. 24, p. 7-11
- Letter Apostolic of Pope Pius IX., s. 1, p. 1-4
- Lichfield, the Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 9
- Life of Cardinal Wiseman, s. 1, p. 13, 14
- his Mother, s. 17, p. 16
- Lincoln, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 6, 7
- London, the Bishop of, Charge to his Clergy, at St. Paul's Cathedral, s. 2, p. 1-13
- on the "Romish Aggression," s. 7, p. 1-4
- on the Rev. Mr. Bennett's Resignation, s. 11, p. 8-11
- Correspondence with the Rev. Mr. Bennett, s. 12, p. 1-10
- City of, Addresses to the Crown, s. 11, p. 1-7
- Loyalty and Patriotism of Card. Wiseman, s. 1, p. 11
- M'Cullagh, W. T., M.P., Speech, s. 21, p. 9, 10
- M'Neile, the Rev. Dr., his Pulpit Attack of the Catholic Confessional, with his reply to the charge, s. 13, p. 10-12
- Masquerade, the Vatican, an article from the *Weekly Dispatch*, s. 3, p. 13-15
- Maule, Right Hon. F., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 12, 13
- "Ministers and the Pope," from the *Quarterly Review*, s. 16, p. 8-16
- Ministerial Crisis, Speeches on the, s. 24, p. 1-7
- "Monster Lie" in reference to the "Taylor Bequest," s. 6, p. 14, 15
- Moore, G. H., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons by, s. 20, p. 2, 3, and ditto, s. 22, p. 13
- Morning Herald*, the, on Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," s. 4, p. 15.
- on the University and City Addresses, s. 11, p. 7
- Morning Post*, the, on Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," s. 5, p. 15, 16
- Morning Chronicle* on ditto, s. 7, p. 7, 8, and on the University and City Addresses, s. 11, p. 6
- Muntz, G. F., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 13, 14.
- Napier, J., M.P., Speech by, s. 22, p. 2-4
- "New Batch of Bishops," an Article from the *Weekly Dispatch*, s. 1, p. 9, 10
- Newport, Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of, s. 8, p. 11, 12
- Nolan, Rev. T., Lecture on the Pope and the Queen, s. 3, p. 1-6
- Norfolk, Duke of, Letter from the, with an article thereon from the *Guardian* newspaper, s. 12, p. 10
- Northampton, Pastoral by the Catholic Bishop of, s. 3, p. 9, 10
- Norwich, the Bishop of, on the different view he takes of the Question, s. 13, p. 13-15
- Nottingham, Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of, s. 12, p. 11, 12
- O'Connor F., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 14
- O'Connell, John, M.P., Speech in the House of Commons, s. 18, p. 10
- ditto, s. 19, p. 12, 13, and ditto, s. 20, p. 8
- Oswald, A., M.P., Speech by, s. 22, p. 11, 12
- Oxford, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 4, 5
- University of, Address to the Crown, s. 11, p. 1-7
- County Meeting, Cardinal Wiseman and Mr. Rochford Clarke, s. 17, p. 14, 15
- Pamphlets, Editorial Remarks on this Series of, s. 6, p. 7, 8; s. 9, p. 1; s. 12, p. 1; s. 13, p. 12, 13; s. 18, p. 1
- "Papal Aggression," "What's it all About?" from "Tait's Magazine," s. 16, p. 1-8
- Parliament, Opening of the Session of, s. 18, p. 1-16
- Pastoral, the, of Cardinal Wiseman, s. 1, p. 4-6
- of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton, s. 3, p. 9, 10
- of the Catholic Bishop of Newport, s. 8, p. 11, 12
- of the Catholic Bishop of Nottingham, s. 12, p. 11, 12
- of the Catholic Bishop of Hexham, s. 12, p. 13-15
- of the Irish Catholic Bishops, s. 24, p. 11-13
- "Papal Aggression," Lord John Russell's Letter on the, s. 1, p. 8
- Disraeli, Benjamin, M.P., on the, s. 1, p. 12, 13
- Rescript, Letter on the, by G. Bowyer, Esq., s. 14, p. 10, 11
- Peel, F., M.P., Speech by, s. 22, p. 16; and s. 23, p. 1-3
- People, Church and State, s. 14, p. 1-5
- Peto, S. M., M.P., Speech in the House of Commons, s. 18, p. 6
- Phillips, A. L., Letter of to the Earl of Shrewsbury, s. 1, p. 14, 15
- Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of the People of England, by "John Bull," s. 4, p. 1-10
- Playfair, Dr. Heber, Letter to Lord John Russell, s. 17, p. 11-14
- Pope Pius IX., Apostolic Letter, s. 1, p. 1-4
- and the Queen, Lecture by the Rev. T. Nolan, s. 3, p. 1-6
- the, the Bishops, and the People, by Henry Vincent, s. 15, p. 1-10
- and the Ministers, from the "Quarterly Review," s. 16, p. 8-16
- alleged Aggression of the, by an Irish Beneficed Clergyman, s. 15, p. 13-15
- Pope's Bull, the, and Dr. Cumming, s. 3, p. 7
- Prayer for the Queen, Bishop Ullathorne's Letter on the, s. 1, p. 7, 8
- "Præmnire," the *Daily News* on, s. 5, p. 13, 14
- Pownall, H., Speech by, s. 3, p. 1
- Protestant Agitation, by "Carolus," s. 11, p. 11-14
- Puseyites, the, and Lord John Russell, s. 12, p. 15, 16
- "Quarterly Review," the, on the Ministers and the Pope, s. 16, p. 8-16
- Queen, Catholic prayer for the, Bishop Ullathorne thereon, s. 1 p. 7, 8
- and the Pope, Lecture on, by the Rev. T. Nolan, s. 3, p. 1-6
- and the Pope, the Catholics' Address on, s. 4, p. 15
- Address to the, from the Bishops of the Established Church, s. 10, p. 16
- Addresses to, from the City of London, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, s. 11, p. 1-7
- Spiritual Supremacy, Observations on, by "G. C.," s. 15, p. 15, 16
- Her Majesty's Speech on opening the Session, s. 18, p. 2, 3
- Reflections by the Editor on the exciting influences and passions brought to bear on the Agitation, s. 6, p. 7, 8
- Remonstrance of the Irish Prelates of the Established Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury, s. 16, p. 16
- Reply to Dr. Cumming's Charges, by G. Bowyer, Esq., s. 10, p. 13-16
- Rescript, the Papal, Letter on the, by G. Bowyer, Esq., s. 14, p. 10, 11
- Reynolds, J., M.P., Speech, s. 20, p. 9-11
- Ripon, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 2, 3
- Roebuck, J. A., M.P., Letter to Lord John Russell, s. 9, p. 1-3
- Speech in the House of Commons, s. 18, p. 6-10, and ditto, s. 19, p. 9-12
- Roman Catholics, the, and Lord John Russell, by the Hon. C. Langdale, s. 6, p. 8, 9

- Roman Catholic Explanation of the "Papal Aggression," s. 6, p. 11-13
- Roche, E. B., M.P., Speech, s. 20, p. 1, 2
- Roden, Earl of, Speech, s. 18, p. 6
- Romilly, Sir John, M.P. (Attorney-General), Speech, s. 20, p. 11-14
- Russell, Lord John, M.P., Letter to the Bishop of Durham, s. 1, p. 8
- Dr. Cumming's remarks thereon, s. 2, p. 14
- and Benjamin Hawes, M.P., s. 3, p. 8
- and the Catholics, by the Hon. C. Langdale, s. 6, p. 8, 9
- Letter to, by J. A. Roebuck, M.P., s. 9, p. 1-3
- Letter to, by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, s. 9, p. 3-13
- Letter to, by Dr. Heber Playfair, s. 17, p. 11-14
- and the Puseyites, s. 12, p. 15, 16
- Bishop Ullathorne's Letter to Lord John Russell on the origin of the New Hierarchy, s. 19, p. 15, 16
- Speech in the House of Commons, s. 18, p. 14-16
- Ditto, s. 19, p. 1-9, and ditto, s. 22, p. 12, 13
- Sadler, J., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 6, 7
- Salisbury, the Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 8, 9
- Scholefield, W., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 14
- Scotland, Episcopal Church of, Address to the English Bishops, s. 13, p. 15, 16
- Scully, F., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 13
- V., lengthened Legal Argument on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, s. 24, p. 7-11
- Sermon by Cardinal Wiseman, s. 10, p. 1-4
- by Dr. Doyle, s. 8, p. 12-14
- Shee, Serj., Historical, Practical, and Legal Speech on the Hierarchical Question, s. 24, p. 14-16
- Shrewsbury, A. L. Phillips' Letter to the Earl of, s. 1, p. 14, 15
- Sibthorp, Col., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 13
- Spectator* newspaper, on Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," s. 7, p. 2-4
- on the Cardinal's Oath, s. 7, p. 11
- Spiritual Supremacy (the Queen's), Observations on, by "G. C.," s. 15, p. 15, 16
- Spooner, R., M.P., Speech by, s. 22, p. 8, 9
- Stanley, Lord, Speech on opening the Session, s. 18, p. 2-4
- Speech on the Ministerial Crisis, s. 24, p. 2-4
- St. Asaph's, Bishop of, Letter to Lord Feilding, s. 3, p. 10-13
- on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 5, 6
- St. David's, the Bishop of, on ditto, s. 8, p. 9, 10
- Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in reference to the Bishops' Address to the Queen, s. 13, p. 7
- State, Church, and People, s. 14, p. 1-5
- Stourton's, Lord, Letter in support of the Catholic Hierarchy, s. 12, p. 10, 11
- Sugden's, Sir E., Speech at Croydon, s. 14, p. 5-8
- "Tait's Magazine" on "the Papal Aggression"— "What's it all About?" s. 16, p. 1-8
- Taylor Bequest, the, and Cardinal Wiseman, s. 6, p. 14, 15
- Tendencies of the Processions of "Guys" and the Burning of Effigies, s. 6, p. 7, 8
- Thompson, Colonel, M.P., Speech by, s. 22, p. 9, 10
- a Letter to the Editor on Cardinal Wiseman's Loyalty and Patriotism, s. 1, p. 11
- on Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," s. 5, p. 12, 13
- Ditto, s. 7, p. 5-7
- on University and City Addresses, s. 11, p. 6
- Ullathorne's, Bishop, Letters to the *Times*, s. 1, p. 6, 7
- on the Prayer for the Queen, s. 1, p. 7, 8
- Letter to Lord John Russell, giving an account of the origin of the new Catholic Hierarchy, s. 19, p. 15, 16
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Addresses from the, to her Majesty, s. 11, p. 1-7
- "Vatican Masquerade," an article from the *Weekly Dispatch*, s. 3, p. 13-15
- Vincent's, Henry, Lecture on the Pope, the Bishops, and the People, s. 15, p. 1-10
- Vision of King Edward the Confessor, s. 1, p. 15
- Wall, B., M.P., Speech by, s. 23, p. 4, 5
- Westminster and its Abbey, Reflections on, by Cardinal Wiseman, s. 5, p. 9
- Weekly Dispatch* on "The New Batch of Bishops," s. 1, p. 9, 10
- on "The Vatican Masquerade," s. 3, p. 13-15
- Weekly News* on Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," s. 7, p. 10, 11
- Westminster Abbey, Interesting Remarks relating to it and the Founder, King Edward the Confessor, s. 1, p. 15
- the Good King's burial therein a few days after its Dedication, s. 1, p. 15
- "What's it all About?" from "Tait's Magazine," s. 16, p. 1-8
- Wiseman's, Cardinal, Pastoral, s. 1, p. 4-6
- Loyalty and Patriotism, s. 1, p. 11
- Birth and Education, s. 1, p. 13, 14
- Dr. Cumming's Lecture on the Cardinal's Teaching, s. 2, p. 13-16
- and Dr. Cumming, with a contrast by the latter, s. 3, p. 7
- and Benjamin Hawes, M.P., s. 3, p. 8
- Author of the English Catholics' Address to the Queen, s. 4, p. 15
- "Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the People of England," s. 5, p. 1-12
- Oath, Dr. Cumming's Lecture on, s. 6, p. 1-3
- Opinions of the leading Journals on the Cardinal's "Appeal," s. 4, 6, 7
- and the Taylor Bequest, s. 6, p. 14, 15
- Sermon at St. George's Cathedral, s. 10, p. 1-4
- Lecture on the Hierarchy, s. 10, p. 4-11
- Oath, Dr. Cumming's Charges, and Mr. Bowyer's Rejoinders, s. 10, p. 11-16
- Second Lecture on the Hierarchy, with contrast between the Catholic and Protestant Bishops, s. 13, p. 7-10
- Letter from Mr. Bowyer, s. 14, p. 9, 10
- Address to, s. 15, p. 11, 12
- Reply to Mr. Rochford Clarke's Attack on his Mother, s. 17, p. 16
- Wiseman, Mrs. (Mother of the Cardinal), and Mr. Rochford Clarke, s. 17, p. 14, 15
- her Birth and Life defended by Fitz-Patrick, s. 17, p. 16
- Wilberforce, Conversion of the Rev. H. W., s. 6, p. 15, 16
- Archdeacon, on the Catholic Hierarchy, s. 8, p. 8
- Winchester, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 5, and 10, 11
- Wood, P., M.P., Speech by, s. 21, p. 5-9
- Worcester, Bishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 8, p. 6
- York, Archbishop of, on the "Romish Aggression," s. 7, p. 13
- Zetland, Lord, Letter from Lord Beaumont to, s. 11, p. 15

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE PIUS IX.;
CARDINAL WISEMAN'S PASTORAL;
THE TWO LETTERS TO THE "TIMES" BY BISHOP ULLATHORNE;
LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S LETTER;
THE "NEW BATCH OF BISHOPS," FROM THE "WEEKLY
DISPATCH;"
TWO LETTERS BY THE REV. G. A. DENISON;
A LETTER FROM BENJAMIN D'ISRAELI, ESQ., M.P.;
REVIEW AND EXTRACTS FROM AMBROSE PHILLIPS'S "LETTER
TO THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY;"
CONCLUDED BY
A BIOGRAPHY OF CARDINAL WISEMAN.

LETTERS APOSTOLICAL.—PIUS P. P. IX.

The power of ruling the universal Church, committed by our Lord *Jesus Christ* to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of *St. Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, hath preserved, through every age, in the Apostolic See, that remarkable solicitude by which it consulteth for the advantage of the Catholic religion in all parts of the world, and studiously provideth for its extension. And this correspondeth with the design of its Divine Founder, who, when he ordained a head to the Church, looked forward, by his excellent wisdom, to the consummation of the world. Amongst other nations, the famous realm of England hath experienced the effects of this solicitude on the part of the Supreme Pontiff. Its historians testify, that in the earliest ages of the Church the Christian religion was brought into Britain, and subsequently flourished greatly there; but about the middle of the fifth age, the Angles and Saxons having been invited into the island, the affairs, not only of the nation, but of religion also, suffered great and grievous injury. But we know that our holy predecessor, *Gregory the Great*, sent first *Augustine the Monk*, with his companions, who subsequently, with several others, were elevated to the dignity of bishops; and a great company of priests, monks, having been sent to join them, the Anglo-Saxons were brought to embrace the Christian religion; and by their exertions it was brought to pass, that in Britain, which had now come to be called England, the Catholic religion was everywhere restored and extended. But to pass on to more recent events, the history of the Anglican schism of the sixteenth age presents no feature more remarkable than the care unremittingly exercised by our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs to lend succour, in its hour of extremest peril, to the Catholic religion in that realm, and by every means to afford it support and assistance. Amongst other instances of this care, are the enactments and provisions made by the chief Pontiffs, or under their direction and approval, for the unfailling supply of men to take charge of the interests of Catholicity in that country; and also for the education of Catholic young men of good abilities on the continent, and their careful instruction in all branches of theological learning; so that, when promoted to holy orders, they might return to their native land and labour diligently to benefit their countrymen, by the ministry of the Word and of the sacraments, and by the defence and propagation of the holy faith.

Perhaps even more conspicuous have been the exertions made by our predecessors for the purpose of restoring to the English Catholics prelates invested with the episcopal character, when the fierce and cruel storms of persecution had deprived them of the presence and pastoral care of their own bishops. The Letters Apostolical of *Pope Gregory XV.*, dated March 23, 1623, set forth that the chief Pontiff, as soon as he was able, had consecrated *William Bishop*, Bishop of Chalcedon, and had appointed him, furnished with an ample supply of faculties, and the authority of ordinary, to govern the Catholics of England and of Scotland. Subsequently, on the death of the said *William Bishop*, *Pope Urban VIII.*, by Letters Apostolical, dated Feb. 4, 1625, to the like effect, and directed to *Richard Smith*, reconstituted him Bishop of Chalcedon, and conferred on him the same faculties and powers as had been granted to *William Bishop*. When the King, *James II.*, ascended the English throne, there seemed a prospect of happier times for the Catholic religion. *Innocent XI.* immediately availed himself of this opportunity to ordain, in the year 1685, *John Leyburn*, Bishop of Adrumetum, Vicar Apostolic

Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.]

[James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row;

Of whom may be had the *Bishop of London's Charge*, and *Dr. Cumming's Lecture*, COMPLETE
IN ONE PAMPHLET, price only One Penny.

of all England. Subsequently, by other Letters Apostolical, issued January 30, 1788, he associated with *Leyburn*, as Vicars Apostolic, three other bishops, with titles taken from churches in *partibus infidelium*; and accordingly, with the assistance of *Ferdinand*, Archbishop of Amaria, Apostolic Nuncio in England, the same Pontiff divided England into four districts, namely the London, the Eastern, the Midland, and the Northern; each of which a Vicar Apostolic commenced to govern, furnished with all suitable faculties, and with the proper powers of a local ordinary. *Benedict XIV.*, by his Constitution, dated May 30, 1753, and the other Pontiffs our predecessors, and our Congregation of Propaganda, both by their own authority and by their most wise and prudent directions, afforded them all guidance and help in the discharge of their important functions. This partition of all England into four Apostolic Vicariates lasted till the time of *Gregory VI.*, who, by Letters Apostolical, dated July 3, 1840, having taken into consideration the increase which the Catholic religion had received in that kingdom, made a new ecclesiastical division of the counties, doubling the number of the Apostolic Vicariates, and committing the government of the whole of England in spirituals to the Vicars Apostolic of the London, the Eastern, the Western, the Central, the Welsh, the Lancaster, the York, and the Northern Districts. These facts that we have cursorily touched upon, to omit all mention of others, are a sufficient proof that our predecessors have studiously endeavoured and laboured that, as far as their influence could effect it, the Church in England might be reformed and recovered from the great calamity that had befallen her.

Having, therefore, before our eyes so illustrious an example of our predecessors, and wishing to emulate it, in accordance with the duty of the Supreme Apostolate, and also giving way to our own feelings of affection towards that beloved part of our Lord's vineyard, we have purposed, from the very first commencement of our pontificate, to prosecute a work so well commenced, and to devote our closer attention to the promotion of the Church's advantage in that kingdom. Wherefore, having taken into earnest consideration the present state of Catholic affairs in England, and reflecting on the very large and everywhere increasing number of Catholics there; considering also that the impediments which principally stood in the way of the spread of Catholicity were daily being removed, we judged that the time had arrived when the form of ecclesiastical government in England might be brought back to that model on which it exists freely amongst other nations, where there is no special reason for their being governed by the extraordinary administration of Vicars Apostolic. We were of opinion that times and circumstances had brought it about, that it was unnecessary for the English Catholics to be any longer guided by Vicars Apostolic; nay more, that the revolution that had taken place in things there was such as to demand the form of Ordinary Episcopal government. In addition to this, the Vicars Apostolic of England themselves, had, with united voice, besought this of us; many also both of the clergy and laity, highly esteemed for their virtue and rank, had made the same petition; and this was also the earnest wish of a very large number of the rest of the Catholics of England. Whilst we pondered on these things, we did not omit to implore the aid of Almighty God that, in deliberating on a matter of such weight, we might be enabled both to discern and rightly to accomplish what might be most conducive to the good of the Church.

We also invoked the assistance of Mary the Virgin, Mother of God, and of those Saints who illustrated England by their virtues, that they would vouchsafe to support us by their patronage with God to the happy accomplishment of this affair. In addition, we committed the whole matter to our venerable brethren the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church of Our Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, to be carefully and gravely considered. Their opinion was entirely agreeable to our own desires, and we freely approved of it, and judged that it be carried into execution. The whole matter, therefore, having been carefully and deliberately consulted upon, of our own motion, on certain knowledge, and of the plenitude of our Apostolical power, we constitute and decree, that in the kingdom of England, according to the common rules of the Church, there be restored the Hierarchy of Ordinary Bishops, who shall be named from Sees, which we constitute in these our Letters, in the several districts of the Apostolic Vicariates. To begin with the London District, there will be in it two Sees; that of Westminster, which we elevate to the degree of the Metropolitan or Archiepiscopal dignity, and that of Southwark, which, as also the others (to be named next), we assign as Suffragan to Westminster. The diocese of Westminster will take that part of the above-named district which extends to the north of the river Thames, and includes the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Hertford; and that of Southwark will contain the remaining part to the south of the river, viz., the counties of Berks, Southampton, Surrey, Sussex, and Kent, with the Islands of Wight, Jersey, Guernsey, and the others adjacent.

In the Northern District there will be only one Episcopal See, which will receive its name from the city of Hexham. This diocese will be bounded by the same limits as the district hath hitherto been.

The York District will also form one Diocese; and the Bishop will have his See at the city of Beverley.

In the Lancashire District there will be two Bishops; of whom the one will take his title from the See of Liverpool, and will have as his diocese the Isle of Man, the hundreds of Lonsdale, Amounderness, and West Derby. The other will receive the name of his See from the city of

Salford and will have for his diocese the hundreds of Salford, Blackburn, and Leyland; the county of Chester, although hitherto belonging to that district, we shall now annex to another diocese.

In the District of Wales there will be two Bishoprics, viz., that of Shrewsbury, and that of Menavia (or St. David's), united with Newport. The Diocese of Shrewsbury to contain, northwards, the counties of Anglesey, Caernarvon, Denbigh, Flint, Merioneth, and Montgomery; to which we annex the county of Chester, from the Lancashire District, and the county of Salop, from the Central District. We assign to the Bishop of St. David's and Newport as his Diocese, northwards, the counties of Brecknock, Glamorgan, Pembroke, and Radnor, and the English counties of Monmouth and Hereford.

In the Western District we establish two Episcopal Sees; that of Clifton and that of Plymouth. To the former of these we assign the counties of Gloucester, Somerset, and Wilts; to the latter those of Devon, Dorset, and Cornwall.

The Central District, from which we have already separated off the county of Salop, will have two Episcopal Sees; that of Nottingham and that of Birmingham. To the former of these we assign, as a Diocese, the counties of Nottingham, Derby, and Leicester, together with those of Lincoln and Rutland, which we hereby separate from the Eastern District. To the latter we assign the counties of Stafford, Warwick, Worcester, and Oxford.

Lastly, in the Eastern District, there will be a single Bishop's See, which will take its name from the city of Northampton, and will have its Diocese comprehended within the same limits as have hitherto bounded the district, with the exception of the counties of Lincoln and Rutland, which we have already assigned to the aforesaid Diocese of Nottingham.

Thus, then, in the most flourishing kingdom of England, there will be established one Ecclesiastical Province, consisting of one Archbishop, or Metropolitan Head, and twelve Bishops his Suffragans; by whose exertions and pastoral cares we trust God will grant to Catholicity in that country a fruitful and daily increasing extension. Wherefore, we now reserve to ourselves and our successors, the Pontiffs of Rome, the power of again dividing the said Province into others, and of increasing the number of Dioceses, as occasion shall require; and in general, that, as it shall seem fitting in the Lord, we may freely decree new limits to them.

In the meanwhile, we command the aforesaid Archbishop and Bishops that they transmit, at due times, to our Congregation of Propaganda, accounts of the state of their Churches, and that they never omit to keep the said Congregation fully informed respecting all matters which they know will conduce to the welfare of their spiritual flocks. For we shall continue to avail ourselves of the instrumentality of the said Congregation in all things appertaining to the Anglican Churches. But in the sacred government of clergy and laity, and in all other things appertaining unto the Pastoral office, the Archbishop and Bishops of England will henceforward enjoy all the rights and faculties which the other Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of other nations, according to the Common Ordinances of the Sacred Canons and Apostolic Constitutions, use, and may use: and are equally bound by the obligations which bind the other Archbishops and Bishops according to the same common discipline of the Catholic Church. And whatever regulations, either in the ancient system of the Anglican Churches or in the subsequent missionary state, may have been in force either by special Constitutions or privileges or peculiar customs, will now henceforward carry no right nor obligation: and in order that no doubt may remain on this point, we, by the plenitude of our Apostolic authority, repeal and abrogate all power whatsoever of imposing obligation or conferring right in those peculiar constitutions and privileges of whatever kind they may be, and in all customs, by whomsoever, or at whatever more ancient or immemorial time brought in. Hence it will for the future be solely competent for the Archbishop and Bishops of England to distinguish what things belong to the executions of the common ecclesiastical law, and what, according to the common discipline of the Church, of entrusted to the authority of the Bishops. We, certainly, will not be wanting to assist them with our Apostolic authority, and most willingly will we second all their applications in those things which shall seem to conduce to the glory of God's name and the salvation of souls. Our principal object, indeed, in decreeing, by these our Letters Apostolic, the restoration of the Ordinary Hierarchy of Bishops, and the observation of the Church's common law, has been to pay regard to the well-being and growth of the Catholic religion throughout the realm of England; but, at the same time, it was our purpose to gratify the wishes both of our venerable brethren who govern the affairs of religion by a vicarious authority from the Apostolic See, and also of very many of our well-beloved children of the Catholic clergy and laity, from whom we had received the most urgent entreaties to the like effect. The same prayer had repeatedly been made by their ancestors to our predecessors, who, indeed, had first commenced to send Vicars Apostolic into England, at a time when it was impossible for any Catholic prelate to remain there in possession of a Church by right in ordinary; and hence their design in successively augmenting the number of Vicariates and Vicarial districts was not certainly that Catholicity in England should always be under an extraordinary form of government, but rather, looking forward to its extension in process of time, they were paving the way for the ultimate restoration of the Ordinary Hierarchy there.

And therefore we, to whom, by God's goodness, it hath been granted to complete this great work, do now hereby declare that it is very far from our intention or design that the Prelates

of England, now possessing the title and rights of Bishops in Ordinary, should, in any other respect, be deprived of any advantages which they have enjoyed heretofore under the character of Vicars Apostolic. For it would not be reasonable that the enactments we now make at the instance of the English Catholics, for the good of religion in their country, should turn to the detriment of the said Vicars Apostolic. Moreover, we are most firmly assured that the same, our beloved children in Christ, who have never ceased to contribute by their alms and liberality, under such various circumstances, to the support of Catholic religion, and of the Vicars Apostolic, will henceforward manifest even greater liberality towards Bishops, who are now bound by a stronger tie to the Anglican Churches, so that these same may never be in want of the temporal means necessary for the expenses of the decent splendour of the churches, and of divine service, and of the support of the clergy, and relief of the poor. In conclusion, lifting up our eyes unto the hills from whence cometh our help, to God Almighty and All-merciful, with all prayer and supplication we humbly beseech Him, that He would confirm by the power of His Divine assistance all that we have now decreed for the good of the Church; and that He would bestow the strength of His grace on those to whom the carrying out of our decrees chiefly belongs, that they may feed the Lord's flock which is amongst them, and that they may each increase in diligent exertion to advance the greater glory of His Name, and in order to obtain the more abundant succours of heavenly grace for this purpose.

We again invoke, as our intercessors with God, the most Holy Mother of God, the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, with the other heavenly patrons of England; and especially *St. Gregory the Great*, that, since it is now granted to our so unequal deserts again to restore the Episcopal Sees in England, which he first effected to the very great advantage of the Church, this restoration also which we make of the Episcopal Dioceses in that kingdom may happily turn to the benefit of the Catholic religion. And we decree that these our Letters Apostolical shall never at any time be objected against or impugned, on pretence either of omission or of addition, or defect either of our intention, or any other whatsoever; but shall always be valid and in force, and shall take effect in all particulars, and be inviolably observed. All general or special enactments notwithstanding, whether Apostolic, or issued in Synodal, Provincial, and Universal Councils; notwithstanding also all rights and privileges of the ancient Sees of England, and of the Missions, and of the Apostolic Vicariates subsequently there established, and of all Churches whatsoever, and pious places, whether established by oath or by Apostolic confirmation, or by any other security whatsoever; notwithstanding, lastly, all other things to the contrary whatsoever. For all these things, in as far as they contravene the foregoing enactments, although a special mention of them may be necessary for their repeal, or some other form, however particular, necessary to be observed, we expressly annul and repeal. Moreover, we decree that if, in any other manner, any other attempt shall be made by any person, or by any authority, knowingly or ignorantly, to set aside these enactments, such attempt shall be null and void. And it is our will and pleasure that copies of these our Letters, being printed and subscribed by the hand of a Notary public, and sealed with the seal of a person high in ecclesiastical dignity, shall have the same authenticity as would belong to the expression of our will by the production of this original copy.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the Seal of the Fisherman, this 29th day of September, 1850, in the fifth year of our Pontificate,

A. CARDINAL LAMBRUSCHINI.

PASTORAL.

Nicholas, by the Divine Mercy, of the Holy Roman Church by the Title of St. Pudenciana Cardinal Priest, Archbishop of Westminster, and Administrator Apostolic of the Diocese of Southwark.

To our Dearly Beloved in Christ, the Clergy Secular and Regular, and the Faithful of the said Archdiocese and Diocese.

Health and Benediction in the Lord:

If this day we greet you under a new title, it is not, dearly beloved, with an altered affection. If in words we seem to divide those who till now have formed, under our rule, a single flock, our heart is as undivided as ever in your regard. For now truly do we feel closely bound to you by new and stronger ties of charity; now do we embrace you, in our Lord Christ Jesus, with more tender emotions of paternal love; now doth our soul yearn, and our mouth is open to you;* though words must fail to express what we feel on being once again permitted to address you. For if our parting was in sorrow, and we durst not hope that we should again face to face behold you, our beloved flock; so much the greater is now our consolation and our joy, when we find ourselves, not so much permitted, as commissioned, to return to you, by the Supreme Ruler of the Church of Christ.

But how can we for one moment indulge in selfish feelings when, through that loving

* Cor. vi. 2.

Father's generous and wise counsels, the greatest of blessings has just been bestowed upon our country, by the restoration of its true Catholic hierarchical government, in communion with the See of Peter.

For on the twenty-ninth day of last month, on the Feast of the Archangel St. Michael, Prince of the Heavenly Host, his Holiness Pope Pius IX. was graciously pleased to issue his Letters Apostolic, under the Fisherman's Ring, conceived in terms of great weight and dignity, wherein he substituted, for the eight Apostolic Vicariates heretofore existing, one Archiepiscopal or Metropolitan and twelve Episcopal Sees : repealing at the same time, and annulling, all dispositions and enactments made for England by the Holy See with reference to its late form of ecclesiastical government.

And by a Brief dated the same day, his Holiness was further pleased to appoint us, though most unworthy, to the Archiepiscopal See of Westminster, established by the above-mentioned Letters Apostolic, giving us at the same time the administration of the Episcopal See of Southwark. So that at present, and till such time as the Holy See shall think fit otherwise to provide, we govern and shall continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Hertford and Essex, as Ordinary thereof, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire, and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, as Administrator with Ordinary jurisdiction.

Further we have to announce to you, dearly beloved in Christ, that, as if still further to add solemnity and honour before the Church to this noble act of Apostolic authority, and to give an additional mark of paternal benevolence towards the Catholics of England, his Holiness was pleased to raise us, in the private Consistory of Monday, the 30th of September, to the rank of Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church. And on the Thursday next ensuing, being the third day of this month of October, in public Consistory, he delivered to us the insignia of this dignity, the Cardinalitial Hat ; assigning us afterwards for our title in the private Consistory which we attended, the Church of St. Pudentiana, in which St. Peter is groundedly believed to have enjoyed the hospitality of the noble and partly British family of the Senator Pudens.

In that same Consistory we were enabled ourselves to ask for the Archiepiscopal Pallium, for our new See of Westminster ; and this day we have been invested, by the hands of the Supreme Pastor and Pontiff himself, with this badge of Metropolitan jurisdiction.

The great work, then, is complete ; what you have long desired and prayed for is granted. Your beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of Catholic Communion : Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had long vanished, and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light and of vigour. How wonderfully all this has been brought about, how clearly the Hand of God has been shown in every step, we have not now leisure to relate ; but we may hope soon to recount to you by word of mouth. In the meantime we will content ourselves with assuring you, that, if the concordant voice of those venerable and most eminent Counsellors to whom the Holy See commits the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in Missionary countries, of the overruling of every variety of interests and designs, to the rendering of this measure almost necessary, if the earnest prayers of our holy Pontiff and his most sacred oblation of the Divine Sacrifice, added to his own deep and earnest reflection, can form to the Catholic heart an earnest of heavenly direction, an assurance that the spirit of truth, who guides the Church, has here inspired its Supreme Head, we cannot desire stronger or more consoling evidence that this most important measure is from God, has His sanction and blessing, and will consequently prosper.

Then truly is this day to us a day of joy and exaltation of spirit, the crowning day of long hopes, and the opening day of bright prospects. How must the saints of our country, whether Roman or British, Saxon or Norman, look down from their seats of bliss with beaming glance upon this new evidence of the Faith and Church which led them to glory, sympathising with those who have faithfully adhered to them through centuries of ill repute, for the truth's sake, and now reap the fruit of their patience and long-suffering. And all those blessed martyrs of these later ages, who have fought the battles of the Faith under such discouragement, who mourned, more than over their own fetters or their own pain, over the desolate ways of their own Sion and the departure of England's religious glory ; oh ! how must they bless God, who hath again visited His people, how take part in our joy, as they see the lamp of the temple again enkindled and re-brightening, as they behold the silver links of that chain which has connected their country with the See of Peter in its Vicarial Government changed into burnished gold ; not stronger nor more closely knit, but more beautifully wrought and more brightly arrayed.

And in nothing will it be fairer or brighter than in this, that the glow of more fervent love will be upon it. Whatever our sincere attachment and unflinching devotion to the Holy See till now, there is a new ingredient cast into these feelings ; a warmer gratitude, a tenderer affection, a profounder admiration, a boundless and endless sense of obligation, for so new, so great, so sublime a gift, will be added to past sentiments of loyalty and fidelity to the supreme See of Peter. Our venerable Pontiff has shown himself a true Shepherd, a true Father ; and we cannot but express our gratitude to him in our most fervent language, in the language of prayer. For when we raise our voices, as is meet, in loud and fervent thanksgiving to the

Almighty for the precious gifts bestowed upon our portion of Christ's vineyard, we will also implore every choice blessing on Him who has been so signally the divine instrument in procuring it. We will pray that his rule over the Church may be prolonged to many years, for its welfare; that health and strength may be preserved to him for the discharge of his arduous duties; that light and grace may be granted to him proportioned to the sublimity of his office; and that consolations, temporal and spiritual, may be poured out upon him abundantly, in compensation for past sorrows and past ingratitude. And of these consolations may one of the most sweet to his paternal heart be the propagation of Holy Religion in our country, the advancement of his spiritual children there in true piety and devotion, and our ever increasing affection and attachment to the See of St. Peter.

In order, therefore, that our thanksgiving may be made with all becoming solemnity, we hereby enjoin as follows:—

1. This our Pastoral Letter shall be publicly read in all the Churches and Chapels of the Archdiocese of Westminster and the Diocese of Southwark, on the Sunday after its being received.

2. On the following Sunday there shall be in every such Church or Chapel a Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, at which shall be sung the *Te Deum*, with the usual versicles and prayers, with the prayer also *Fidelium Deus Pastor et Rector*, for the Pope.

3. The Collect *Pro Gratiarum Actione*, or Thanksgiving, and that for the Pope shall be recited in the Mass of that day and for two days following.

4. Where Benediction is never given, the *Te Deum*, with its prayers, shall be recited or sung after Mass, and the Collects above named shall be added as enjoined.

And at the same time earnestly entreating for ourselves also a place in your fervent prayers, we lovingly implore for you and bestow on you the Blessing of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome, this seventh day of October, in the year of Our Lord MCCCCL. (Signed) NICHOLAS,

Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

By command of his Eminence,

FRANCIS SEARLE, Secretary.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—As the only Catholic bishop now in England who has been immediately engaged in negotiating the re-establishment of our episcopal hierarchy, I beg to offer a few remarks, bearing reference to your strictures on that measure.

It is an act solely between the Pope and his own spiritual subjects, who are recognised as such by the Emancipation Act. It regards only spiritual matters. In all temporal matters we are subject to, and are guided by, the laws of the land.

Every communion in the land has its own territorial divisions of the country for religious purposes, with reference to its own members. The Episcopalians in Scotland, and the Wesleyans in England, each mark out territorial lines for their own purposes of spiritual jurisdiction, and the administration of the temporalities of their Churches. These are acts of religious jurisdiction; and the Catholic community cannot exercise jurisdiction without the Pope. Now the increase of Catholics in England, not merely by conversions, but far more by the vast influx of Irish subjects, necessarily demanded an increase of bishops. Bishops cannot be increased amongst us except by the Pope, nor without a new territorial division. In 1688 England was divided into four vicariates. In 1840 the four were again divided into eight. In 1850 the eight vicariates are again divided and changed into thirteen dioceses. This last change is the result of frequent and earnest petitions from the Catholics of England to the Pope. In 1846 two bishops proceeded to Rome with a view to this matter, on the ground of the spiritual wants of the Catholics of England. In 1848 another bishop was delegated to the Holy See, with still more earnest petitions for an increase of bishops and the establishment of the hierarchy. The arrangement was then brought to its conclusion, when the troubles which befel the Roman States put a temporary stop to its execution.

In America, and in our own colonies, similar new divisions of territory have been continually made with increase in our Episcopacy, without exciting a clamour at the spiritual wants of our fellow-Catholics being thus provided for as their numbers increased. Either the power is in our own hands of obtaining all necessary supplies for our spiritual wants as Catholics, or else a real emancipation is not yet granted to us.

By changing the Vicars Apostolic into bishops in ordinary, the Pope, instead of increasing, has given up the exercise of a portion of his power over his spiritual subjects in this country; those not such are in no way affected by his act.

It is difficult for the uninitiated to comprehend the technicalities of a Papal document. Hitherto, and for ages past, the Pope has acted not merely as chief pastor, but also as immediate bishop, in this country. He has governed through his own vicars, bishops holding

foreign sees, nominated by the Pope as his vicars, and revocable at his will. By establishing the hierarchy the Pope has divested himself of the office of our immediate bishop, and has conferred it on Englishmen instead. Catholic Bishops in England are no longer the Pope's Vicars, but English Bishops, having power to form their own constitution of government by express concession, and no longer revocable at will, whilst their successors will be raised to their sees by canonical election. The entire measure has been one of liberality and concession on the part of his Holiness, and as such the Catholics of England understand it and receive it with gratitude.

We feel that his Holiness has transferred from his own hands into ours the local episcopacy, and that even as sovereign Pontiff he has set limits to his power in regard to us, by constituting the canonical order of things, and literally giving us self-government, retaining only his supremacy. It is unfair to confound this boon of liberty to the Catholic Church in England with ideas of aggression on the English Government and people as it is to confound the acts of Pius IX. as Pope with the notion of his temporal Sovereignty. For my part, engaged as I have been in the negotiation throughout, I know that no political objects are contemplated in it. It was an arrangement much needed by the Catholics of England for their spiritual concerns, and I am, with all English Catholics, thankful for it, and I have no fear or alarm for consequences.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,
W. B. ULLATHORNE.

Bishop's House, Birmingham, October 22, 1850.

The following letter has been addressed to the *Times* by the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Birmingham, in answer to one which appeared in that paper under the signature of "Catholicus;"—

SIR,—The remarks of your correspondent "Catholicus" upon my letter respecting the prayer for the Queen oblige me to offer a fuller explanation than I at first thought it necessary to trouble you with. I stated merely the facts, to which I must now add the reason. I do not know what passed between Cardinal Wiseman and his clergy, but gave the regulation made by the bishops. I said, also, that the form of words added to the Post-communion—which is correctly given by your correspondent—was not authorised in any Catholic country. Since then I have found in the Decrees of the Congregation of Rites a remarkable exception to this statement, by tracing the origin of this prayer to a special privilege granted by Pope Pius V. to the kingdoms of Spain. This appears by two decrees, Nos. 144 and 2,921, in *Gardellini's Collection*, which were designed to prevent any extension of the privilege beyond the original concession. This exception makes the general rule the more striking and obligatory, and explains, also, how the prayer came into use in London—viz., through the chapels of the Spanish Ambassador, and of other nations subject to Spain at the date of the original decree, as being the prayer for their own Sovereign. This without the bishops at the time adverting to exceptional decree may have come into general use, the fact that no extension of the privilege could be canonically made except by obtaining another decree to that effect, for no individual bishop has power to change the rubrics at will, and certainly not to add a Post-communion, anomalous in itself, without the permission of the authority that first granted the privilege within certain limits. And a difficulty adverted to by "Catholicus" stood in the way of obtaining such a concession. It has always been a rule in the Church not to mention by name in the words of the mass any person who is not a member of the Church. It follows not from this that the Queen is not fervently prayed for in our churches, but that her Majesty's name is not publicly pronounced in the mass, though it may be in the private commemorations both of priest and people. The public prayer for the Queen must be after the mass or before it, and neither Cardinal Wiseman nor any Catholic bishop of England has power to make it otherwise.

It does not follow from my former statement that the Queen is not prayed for where there is not High Mass. I stated the matter briefly and avoided details. Where there is no deacon, sub-deacon, or choir, of course the priest and congregation recite the prayers for the Queen. The usual rule is to pray publicly for the Queen at the principal service on each Sunday. I may add, that where the Antiphon is not sung, it is common to recite the Psalm beginning "May the Lord hear thee in the day of tribulation; may the name of the God of Jacob protect thee." I may also remark that the prayer "Quæsumus," given in my former letter, is not only taken from the missal, but is the ancient one contained in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great.

May I be allowed, before concluding, to make an observation upon the letters of the Bishop of London and Archdeacon Hale. So far as those letters refer to the act of the Pope, they are met by a simple distinction founded in fact. The Pope does not legislate upon the national establishment, but for the Church over which he presides. That English Catholics are the Pope's spiritual subjects, is recognised by the Emancipation Act every time that we are designated as "Priests of the Church of Rome," and as "Roman Catholics." Had the former laws and usages of our Church been left, as such, unabrogated, we might as Bishops have been subject to papal bulls in the performance of our duties, and only with reference to

what might or might not still remain in force, but also by being incumbered with regulations no longer applicable to our circumstances. We are now left to confirm anew whatever local regulations and customs may be still expedient; we are freed in our ministrations from those which are not suitable, and we have the whole *jus commune* to draw from for what may be further required. In other words, his Holiness leaves us, as Catholic Bishops, to legislate for religious purposes as we see expedient, without any tie from the past. He deals not with the laws of the State, but with those of our Church.

I remain, sir, your very obedient servant,

W. B. ULLATHORNE.

Bishop's House, Birmingham, Oct. 31.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL AND THE POPE.

TO THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

MY DEAR LORD,—I agree with you in considering “the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism” as “insolent and insidious,” and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject.

I not only promoted to the utmost of my power the claims of the Roman Catholics to all civil rights, but I thought it right, and even desirable, that the ecclesiastical system of the Roman Catholics should be the means of giving instruction to the numerous Irish immigrants in London and elsewhere, who without such help would have been left in heathen ignorance.

This might have been done, however, without any such innovation as that which we have now seen.

It is impossible to confound the recent measures of the Pope with the division of Scotland into dioceses by the Episcopal Church, or the arrangement of districts in England by the Wesleyan Conference.

There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England, and a claim to sole and undivided sway, which is inconsistent with the Queen’s supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation, as asserted even in Roman Catholic times.

I confess, however, that my alarm is not equal to my indignation.

Even if it shall appear that the ministers and servants of the Pope in this country have not transgressed the law, I feel persuaded that we are strong enough to repel any outward attacks. The liberty of Protestantism has been enjoyed too long in England to allow of any successful attempt to impose a foreign yoke upon our minds and consciences. No foreign prince or potentate will be permitted to fasten his fetters upon a nation which has so long and so nobly vindicated its right to freedom of opinion, civil, political, and religious.

Upon this subject, then, I will only say that the present state of the law shall be carefully examined, and the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumptions of power deliberately considered.

There is a danger, however, which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign Sovereign.

Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen’s supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, “step by step, to the very verge of the precipice.” The honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his charge to the clergy of his diocese.

What, then, is the danger to be apprehended from a foreign prince of no great power, compared to the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself?

I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their insidious course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not hate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of a nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.

I remain, with great respect, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

Downing-street, Nov. 4.

THE NEW BATCH OF BISHOPS.

Orthodoxy is at last condemned to find the Bishop's foot in its soup, and to have its digestion spoiled by the dyspepsia of panic. Dr. Wiseman has been made a Cardinal—a "foreign potentate" has dealt out hierarchical honours among us, and the Pope has created Westminster into an archiepiscopal see of the Holy Roman Empire. It is not in her civil capacity that the Queen can be the head of the Church—if the Church be anything else than a mere political institution. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." The Founder of the faith of Europe has declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." If the Anglican Church be a member of the Universal Church, its head must have an universal authority, which in her civil capacity the sovereign of these realms has not. It is not in her secular, but solely in her spiritual character, that the Monarch can have ecclesiastical power; and if solely in that capacity, then her political power can have no prevalence in the jurisdiction. But the soul knows no parish—the immortal spirit owns no country, or merely territorial allegiance; universality of kingdom implies the absence of geographical boundary in the dominion of religion, and is, and must be, as ignorant of, as independent upon, topographical limit, as soul is in communion with soul. "The hour cometh, and now is, when neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father, but in spirit and in truth." Then wherefore this furious outcry from the *Times* and its pretended correspondents against the assumption of Pontifical powers in England by the Pope? Where is the "impudence," as it is with disgusting vulgarity and arrogance called by the fanatics of Anglicanism, of the head of the Roman Catholic Church exercising the undoubted powers which are conceded to it by those who own its allegiance? As a purely ecclesiastical authority, that of the Pope is the most ancient, the most legitimate in its descent, the most venerable and august in its traditions, the most certainly lineal and legal in its universal reign, of any in the world. The whole of Europe at one time sincerely and unanimously prostrated itself before it. All other Churches are but mushrooms and upstarts, created solely by successful reason to, and overmastering rebellion against it. As a faith claiming to have sway over men's consciences, and rule over men's souls, it is infinitely more respectable, intelligible, rational, than that of the Queen, in these or any other realms. It is, at least, constituted by lineal apostolic succession. The Pope has, from the beginning of the institution of the office to this hour, been chosen and elected from among a regularly ordained priesthood, by the unanimous choice of the Faithful, at the call of the members of the Church, and by the election of a true ecclesiastical convocation of the Fathers of the Faithful. On what pretence can any one of these signs of legitimate spiritual power be assigned either to that original ruffian, by Divine grace, Henry the Eighth, who made himself a Pontiff by Act of Parliament, or to the present Queen, his latest successor, by whose dispensation not one of the sacraments of the Church would confessedly have any efficacy, and who was called to be the Mother of the Faithful, and head of the "Holy Catholic Church," at the ripe age of nineteen? The Pope and his people have all the decencies of logic, and all the proprieties of reason, clearly on their side in this competition of assumption. The world has first been astounded to observe that a whole conclave of ecclesiastics, with the strenuous support of the majority of their brethren in other dioceses, have refused to own the authority of their titular on the express ground that Dr. Hampden, the Bishop of Hereford, was a rank heretic. The pious have with no less astonishment seen a pastor having the cure of souls arraigned by his Bishop, and convicted in the Spiritual Courts of heresy and schism, and afterwards declared by the Queen alone, as the ultimate and over-ruling interpreter of Divine truth, to be perfectly orthodox, and entirely worthy of spiritual acceptance. It would be to insult the plain understanding of serious men to ask them which authority is the more respectable, the more worthy of allegiance in ecclesiastical and spiritual questions—an ordained Priest chosen by the whole fathers of the Church, or a female minor—a "miss in her teens," whose only imposition of hands, and reception of the Holy Ghost, has been an Act of Parliament, the Herald's Trumpet, and the *Gazette*. Nor is there any redeeming feature in the nature of Protestant Episcopacy or Presbyterianism which, regarded in the mere light of ecclesiastical institutions, should render it a duty in men to concede to them the virtue of recognising greater liberty of conscience, and entitle them to lay claim to the credit of having exercised a greater abstinence from spiritual tyranny than the Church of Rome, as a counterbalance to the greater consistency of pastoral authority, and a less anomalous and more legitimate tenure of religious power. It is not in the Churches of England and Scotland, but out of them, that we are to look for the sources of that Christian liberty which we enjoy in a greater measure than is conceded to the subjects of Catholic countries. Public opinion, the force of character, the intelligence of the people of this country, have wrested from established Churches those powers of persecution which they only praise themselves for not exercising because they are not permitted its use, but which are as emphatically asserted in their canons as they are practised by that Church of

Rome the bitterness of their hatred to which is, that it too nearly resembles themselves. Their Athanasian Creed hands over all Unitarians to the Devil with chronological punctuality once a month. They drag a schismatic before the Ecclesiastical Courts, and punish him for contumacy by fine and imprisonment. The Westminster clergy, in their address to the Bishop of London, arrogate to themselves the power to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines," and declare that "the Queen's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes as in temporal;" while the Thirty-nine Articles, very distinctly assert that she should rule "all estates and degrees, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn." The "Visitation for the Sick" directs that "then shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins! after which confession the Priest shall absolve him after this sort:—By his (Christ's) authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins." The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland is still more impudently Papistical. Its 30th Chapter asserts, with the most shameless effrontery, that to its (Section 2.) "officers the keys of the kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners!" Its 20th Chapter, which, strangely enough, is entitled, "Of Christian liberty, and liberty of conscience," distinctly maintains the right of the Assembly to suppress "erroneous opinions or practices," by "the power of the civil magistrate" (Section 4th); and Chapter 23rd, Section 3rd, "tells the civil magistrate 'that' it is his duty to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed!" And they wind up their bastard Popery with this climax (Chapter 26th, and Section 6th): "The Pope of Rome is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God." The "son of perdition!" Why? Is it for the powers of the confessional? Those are arrogated equally by the Anglican Priest. Is it for the assumption of the power of absolution? That is directly claimed, equally by the service of the Established Church of England, and by the Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland. Is it for claiming the right to prosecute for heresy? That is a power distinctly vindicated and assumed by the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession. Is it for its claims to infallibility? Where is that more distinctly avowed than by the Lutheran and Calvinistic clergy, who absolve from sin, proclaim their possession of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, sit in judgment upon opinion, and, in the case of the Anglicans, claim descent and lineal succession from the Apostles, and the inheritance of exclusive powers to wash away original sin by water made holy by being taken into their apostolical hand. "See'st thou yond' justice rail at that simple thief? Change places, and, handy-dandy, which is the justice, and which the thief?" Why all this outcry about the assumption of mere names, and titles, and ecclesiastical jurisdictions? It is because the whole fabric of episcopacy is but a name, a title, a carnal polity; it is because "New presbyter is but old priest writ large;" it is because men are opening their eyes to the fact that, if there is to be any human spiritual authority interposed betwixt God and man's own conscience, that which is claimed by the Pope, through unbroken tradition, by original ordination, by high antiquity, by ecclesiastical choice, and by separation to the office, is infinitely more respectable, consistent, venerable, and logical, than that which the Anglican priesthood thrusts upon the Queen, much in the same spirit as the Eastern Priests do in the elevation of a boy to the Godship of the Dalai Lama, not from any reverence for him, but for the success of their own imposture. We are glad that Popery has at last come to the death-grapple with Episcopacy. We respect the consistency of those dreaming parsons who become "perverts," as they are called, to the Church of Rome, but who are really only honestly carrying Anglican principles to their logical conclusion. When parsons see that they cannot have their cake and eat it, the time will be at hand when they will also see that they must either resign their priestly pretensions, or be contented to concede them to, and share them with, the Pope. It is only the higher classes who are moonstruck with these monstrous superstitious. At the very time when peers, parsons, and right honourables are becoming Anglicans and Papists, we see reports from nearly every Catholic diocese in Ireland of the alarming spread of conversion to Protestantism among the poor population of the sister kingdom. Superstition is spreading among the rich, and intelligent religion among the masses. The Bishop of London, in answer to the address of his clergy, observes, "The appointment of Bishops to preside over new dioceses in England, constituted by a Papal brief, is virtually a denial of the legitimate authority of the British Sovereign and of the English Episcopate; a denial also of the validity of our orders, and an assertion of spiritual jurisdiction over the whole Christian people of the realm." Well, this denial is no more than we make, than all Dissenters proclaim, than the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts formally made law. And the assertion of spiritual jurisdiction over the whole Christian people of this realm is not confined to the Pope, but is equally, confidently, and falsely arrogated by the Anglican priesthood, and with quite as little, if not with less reason.—*W. W. G. Dispatch.*

CARDINAL WISEMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Regretting as I do the acrimonious feelings which have been so freely used in reference to the Pope's Bull and Cardinal Wiseman, I trust to your sense of justice to allow me (a nearly forty years' subscriber to your valuable journal) to remark on the last sentence of the letter of "Catholicus" in your to-day's paper. I do not believe Dr. Wiseman capable of "surreptitiously" doing anything under a "specious pretext." Of this I am quite sure; that a man imbued with a truer sense of patriotism towards our country, or of affectionate devotion to her Most Gracious Majesty, does not exist in the kingdom. My judgment in this matter is formed from facts within my own knowledge, assisted by his published sermons and other works from his pen.

It is not my province, neither am I qualified, to defend Drs. Wiseman and Ullathorne on the exciting questions at issue, but I cannot help expressing my conviction that, if the public would do the same as every good and true Catholic in England is bound to do—look at the Pope's Bull and the Cardinal's Pastoral as matters of faith and spiritual import, quite irrespective of civil and political observances and rights, they would then see in their proper light how comparatively easy a thing it would be to reconcile their prejudices to what is, in a political and civil sense, an inoperative title, having no real reference either to the throne or the civil and political institutions of our common country.

In conclusion, I feel assured that if this acrimonious line of argument and feeling is persevered in, it will do more to injure the Established Church of our beloved country than the notorious and lamentable Gorham controversy.

Yours,

G.

November 5, 1850.

The following letter has been addressed to the *Times* by the Rev. George A. Denison on the subject of the outcry excited by that paper against the Catholic Hierarchy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—Having the misfortune to disagree altogether with you upon a great public question, I have to ask of your courtesy the insertion of this letter.

You are labouring to excite a strong general feeling in the minds of all the people of England who are not Roman Catholics, Churchmen and Dissenters indiscriminately, under the common and convenient appellation of "Protestants," against the step which has just been taken by the Pope in creating a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, with other bishops.

Now, without being in any way a friend either *presenti* or *futuro* to Roman Catholicism, I take leave to doubt whether it will not be one of the most unwise and unhappy things that an English Churchman can do to follow your lead in this matter.

The Roman Catholics have done nothing but what, in this land of "civil and religious liberty," the law permits them to do. I suppose, then, it is meant that all "Protestants" are to combine in order to take away from the English Roman Catholics that freedom from all interference with their "purely spiritual" concerns on the part of the civil power, which is at present secured by law to every religious body within her Majesty's dominions, save only and except the Church of England.

I cannot doubt but that it must have occurred to many, as it has occurred to myself, that when the *Times* newspaper is found to suggest such things, there is a good deal behind which remains to be explained.

You have, with great candour, supplied the explanation yourself: and it appears that it is not so much any concern for what Rome may teach or not teach, or for what measures she may take, according as the law permits, in common with other religious bodies, in hostility to the Church of England, as a desire to seize upon the occasion which this move of Rome appears to supply, to try and make some members of the Catholic Church of England forget, and to blind others to the fact, that they have an enemy at home nearer and more dangerous by far than Rome. I refer especially to the concluding portion of your leading article of Wednesday last, Oct. 30.

The warfare which the Church of England has to wage in these days is only secondarily against Rome; her first and greatest enemy is the latitudinarianism of the State. The first and great evil against which she has to contend is the endeavour of the State to denude her step by step of her Catholic character. It is only in the same proportion that the State succeeds in this endeavour that the Church of England has anything to apprehend from Rome.

I trust it may not be too late to warn members of the Catholic Church of England to beware how they combine with everything that is anti-Catholic in one "Protestant" outcry against

something which is Catholic, but which, by its many corruptions of the faith, and by its own formal decree, has separated from itself the Catholic Church of England.

If there had not been of late years multiplied aggressions of the State of England upon the Catholic character of the Church of England, and so little sign of any real purpose and endeavour on the part of the Church to vindicate her faith, it might well be doubted whether Rome would have judged that the time was now come for the move she has lately made, and from which, we may rest assured, she will not recede.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

Rectory, East Brent, All Saints' Day.

THE REAL DANGER OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

The brother of the Heresiarch of Salisbury has addressed the following letter to the *Guardian*: MY DEAR SIR,—What is the real danger of the Church of England? It is that the state of England, being itself no longer Catholic, should succeed by direct assault, indirect influence, and refusal of rights and liberties, in divesting the Church of England, by successive steps, of her Catholic character.

When this has been done—and I am not afraid to say that it is in rapid progress—then the choice left to the English people will be between infidelity and Rome.

The last five years have witnessed five direct assaults:—

1. The case of the appointment to the See of Hereford.
2. The Madeira Chaplaincy case.
3. The Gorham case.
4. The attempt to crush Church education.
5. The University Commission.

Numbers 4 and 5 are instances of the combination of direct assault with indirect influence.

The refusal to allow Convocation to sit and deliberate, and the prostitution of the sacred offices of the Church by compelling, under penalties, their indiscriminate and profane use, fill up the list.

For how many more of these things is the Church of England going to wait?

In how many more is she going to acquiesce, uttering nothing but a feeble and very partial remonstrance? With a great majority of her Bishops encouraging her to think that there is nothing to fear, and actually congratulating herself upon her position as compared with other Churches, though, in her corporate capacity, she is doing absolutely nothing to vindicate the faith.

The *Times* newspaper, being well aware of the real state of the case, is playing the game of the State, and trying to divert the just indignation of Churchmen from the multiplied aggressions of the Civil Power to the aggressions of Rome.

Now, Rome neither has, nor can have, any real power or influence in England over the mass of the people, but in exact proportion to the failure of the Catholic character of the Church of England.

It appears to me simple madness to allow ourselves to be influenced by the art, and the fallacies, and the blustering of the *Times*; and I confess that I am, for one, quite unable to understand why English clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, who have so long silently acquiesced in the existence and full development of the Roman hierarchy in Ireland, and have said nothing about the Vicar-Apostolic of Rome in England, should, all of a sudden, be excited to such vehement indignation by the appointment of a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

Let us look at home.

Let us amend the excess of the secular character among ourselves.

Let us have more of humiliation and less self-gratulation.

Let us absolutely refuse, at whatever cost, or under whatever pretext, to “render unto Cæsar” “the things of God.”

Let us allow no consideration of any kind to bind us to the great harm and loss that is being inflicted every day by State power and influence upon the Catholic character of the Church of England.

Let us do something more than make speeches and protests, and pass resolutions.

Let us, Bishops, clergy, and people, do not suffer for the Catholic faith.

And then we need not concern ourselves about Cardinal Archbishops of Westminster.

Very faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

The following letter has been addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Buckingham by Mr Disraeli:—

MY LORD,—I have received numerous appeals from my constituents requesting that I would co-operate with them in addressing your Lordship to call a meeting of the county, in order

that we may express our reprobation of the recent assault of the Court of Rome on the prerogatives of our Sovereign and the liberties of her subjects.

I think it very desirable that a meeting of the county should be called for that purpose, but, as far as I can gather from what reaches me, great misapprehension is afloat respecting the circumstances which now so violently, but so justly, excite the indignation of the country.

Men are called upon to combine to prevent foreign interference with the prerogatives of the Queen, and to resist jurisdiction by the Pope in her Majesty's dominions.

But I have always understood that, when the present Lord-Lieutenant arrived in his Vice-royalty, he gathered together the Romish Bishops of Ireland, addressed them as nobles, sought their counsel, and courted their favour. On the visit of her Majesty to that kingdom the same prelates were presented to the Queen as if they were nobles, and precedence was given them over the nobility and dignitaries of the national Church; and it was only the other day, as I believe, that the Government offered the office of Visitor to the Queen's Colleges to Dr. Cullen, the Pope's delegate, and *pseudo* Archbishop of Armagh, and to Dr. M'Hale, the *pseudo* Archbishop of Tuam. What wonder, then, that his Holiness should deem himself at liberty to apportion England into dioceses, to be ruled over by his bishops! And, why, instead of supposing he has taken a step "insolent and insidious," should he not have assumed he was acting in strict conformity with the wishes of her Majesty's Government.

The fact is, that the whole question has been surrendered, and decided in favour of the Pope, by the present Government; and the Ministers who recognised the *pseudo* Archbishop of Tuam as a peer and a prelate, cannot object to the appointment of a *pseudo* Archbishop of Westminster, even though he be a cardinal. On the contrary, the loftier dignity should, according to their table of precedence, rather invest his Eminence with a still higher patent of nobility, and permit him to take the wall of his Grace of Canterbury and the highest nobles of the land.

The policy of the present Government is, that there shall be no distinction between England and Ireland. I am, therefore, rather surprised that the Cabinet are so "indignant," as a certain letter with which we have just been favoured informs us they are.

I have made these observations in order that, if the county meets, the people of Buckinghamshire may understand that the question on which they will have to decide is of a graver, deeper, and more comprehensive character than, in the heat of their laudable emotion, they may perhaps suppose.

I have the honour to be, my lord,

Your faithful servant,

B. DISRAELI.

Hughenden Manor, Nov. 8th.

Cardinal Wiseman is now in his 49th year, having been born at Seville, on August, 2, 1802. He is descended from an Irish family, long settled in Spain. At an early age he was brought to England, and sent for his education to St. Cuthbert's Catholic college, at Ushaw, near Durham. From thence, having gone through the "humanities" with success, he was removed to the English college at Rome, where he distinguished himself by an extraordinary attachment to learning. At the age of eighteen, he published in Latin a work on the Oriental languages; and he bore off the gold medal at every competition of the colleges at Rome. His merit recommended him to his superiors; he obtained several honours, was ordained a Priest, and dubbed a Doctor of Divinity. He was a Professor, for a number of years, in the Roman University; and then Rector of the English college where he had achieved his earliest success.

The Cardinal returned again to England after he had reached manhood in 1835; and in the winter of that year delivered a series of lectures on the Sundays in Advent. From the moment of his arrival he attracted attention, and soon became a conspicuous teacher and writer on the side of the Catholics. In Lent, 1836, he vindicated, in a course of Lectures—delivered at St. Mary's, Moorfields—the doctrines of the Catholic Church; and gave so much satisfaction to his co-religionists, that they presented him with a gold medal, struck by Mr. Scipio Clint, to express their esteem and gratitude, and commemorate the event. He returned to Rome, and seems to have been instrumental in inducing Pope Gregory XVI. to increase the Vicars Apostolic in England. The number was doubled; and Dr. Wiseman came back as coadjutor to Bishop Walsh, of the Midland district. He was appointed president of St. Mary's College, Oscott, and contributed, by his teaching, his preaching, and his writings, very much to promote the spread of Catholicism in England. He is a frequent contributor to the *Dublin Review*, and the author of some controversial works and pamphlets. In 1847 he again repaired to Rome on the affairs of the Catholics, and no doubt prepared the way for the present change. It was resolved on in 1848, but delayed by the troubles which then ensued at Rome.

The Cardinal's second visit to Rome led to further preferment. He was made pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London district, in place of Dr. Griffiths, deceased. Subsequently he was appointed coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, translated to London, *ex jure et successione*; and in 1849, on the death of Dr. Walsh, he became Vicar Apostolic of the London district. To him the Catholic body acknowledges itself indebted, in conjunction with the Rev. Dr. Dayle, for the completion and dedication of the Cathedral Church in St. George's-fields. It seems, however, to regard his last service as the greatest. In August he went again to Rome, "not expecting," as he says, "to return;" but "delighted to be commissioned to come back" clothed in his new dignity. His success in negotiating the re-establishment of the Romish hierarchy amongst us in all its splendour, seems to have gratified his Holiness. In a Consistory held on September

30, Nicholas Wiseman was elected to the dignity of Cardinal, by the title of Saint Pudentiana, and was appointed Archbishop of Westminster. Under the Pope, he is the head of the Roman Catholic Church of England, and a Prince of the Church of Rome.

That Cardinal Wiseman possesses great abilities and a ready and fascinating eloquence, is evident; from his previous success, and his very marked hostility to the English Church, his Holiness could scarcely have nominated a person to the new dignity he has created less acceptable than Cardinal Wiseman to the non-Romish portion of the people. His Holiness has carried out a partitioning of England in a most decided manner. No statute is, we believe, violated by the Pope or the Cardinal.

Cardinal Wiseman is the seventh English Cardinal since the Reformation. The other six were Pole, Allen, Howard, York (a son of the Pretender, who was never in England), Weld, and Acton (member of an English family, we believe, long settled in Naples).

A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury, Waterford, and Wexford, on the Re-establishment of the Hierarchy of the English Catholic Church, and the Present Posture of Catholic Affairs in Great Britain. By Ambrose Lisle Phillips, Esq. London: Dolman.

This is just the sort of letter we should have expected at the present juncture from the pen of an English Catholic Layman; and is just what we should expect from the hand of an English gentleman, so much like those of the olden time, as Ambrose Lisle Phillips, Esq., of Grace Dieu Manor. Manly, temperate, English, Catholic, it is a true specimen of what we should expect from an English Catholic gentleman upon the present crisis. The following is the opening sentence of this letter to Lord Shrewsbury:—

“MY DEAR LORD.—The great event, for which we have been all so long and so earnestly labouring, for which our most devout prayers have been poured forth to the Throne of Grace, has at length taken place. Our most Holy Father, Pope Pius the Ninth, has by his Apostolical power, and in his great wisdom and goodness, restored to the English Catholic Church her long lost Hierarchy. What our faithful ancestors for the last three centuries were constantly sighing for, what they prayed for in their dungeons and on the scaffold, we have at length been permitted to behold; surely our hearts should expand with joy and gratitude, our voices should be lifted up to thank and to glorify the Successor of St. Peter, and to invoke upon his sacred head the choicest blessings of our Lord, whose chief Vicar on earth he is.”

Mr. Ambrose Phillips then proceeds to run through the different attacks that have been levelled by the Protestant press against the spiritual boon to Catholics, with which Catholics are alone concerned. These he disposes of in a trenchant manner. The following shows what he believes to be the absurdity of this outcry:—

“But how absurd this outcry is! If the Wesleyan Conference were to divide England into new circuits, we should hear of no remonstrances; when the Free Kirk Secession in Scotland set up Presbyteries in opposition to those of the Establishment, we heard of no one invoking the interference of the secular power: we did not hear that the Secretary of State for the Home Department was summoned to her Majesty's presence in consequence. Why, then, is it, that such an outcry is raised at this act of the Catholic Church? Is she alone to be excepted from the general toleration or the general indifference? What is this but a tacit acknowledgment on the part of Protestants, that their only argument, after all, is force; and that when the Catholic Church comes before us with no other weapons but those of sound reason and common sense, the advocates of the unlimited right of private judgment have no reply but a significant point to the Statute Book and the absolute annals of Persecution.”

Mr. Phillips also dwells on the real motive and design of the present agitation, and his views of the character of the whole affair is remarked on in the following passage:—

“But, says the *Times*, the Pope should have asked the permission of the British Government, or at least he should have sounded their feelings on the subject. The Pope tells us he did, and that when Lord Minto was sent (as Mr. Baillie Cochrane affirms in his “Young Italy”) to undermine the Pope's Government, his Holiness was assured by that statesman, that the English Government would have no objection to these titles. And why should it? They give the Pope no new powers in England, all that they do is to put an end to an anomaly. Henceforwards our Bishops take their titles from the flocks they really govern, not from distant sees, where they never reside. Surely there is common sense in what the Pope has done, but where is the common sense in making an outcry against it? I should understand the meaning of this outcry if it went a little further, if it said boldly at once, We feel that Protestant argument cannot stand the force of Catholic argument; only give Catholicism fair play, and Protestantism must fall before it, therefore keep it down by main force; do not let them call their Bishops by their true names, lest peradventure the people should one day take them for the real Bishops and look upon ours as the sham: in a word, we thought in 1829 that we might safely tolerate Catholicism, and that, removing from it the prestige of persecution, it would die a natural death. but events have baffled our theory; the progress this

obscure superstition has since made proves that nothing can withstand its arguments but main force. If we do not wish England to be Catholic once more, we must somehow or other crush the Catholics: *per fas et nefas*, we must do this or we shall do nothing. Now a glorious opportunity has come to stir up the bigotry of all the anti-Catholic sects, let us once more raise, if we can, the old No Popery cry."

At the end of this letter is an anecdote, which informs us of a vision seen by the Blessed Royal Saint of England Edward the Confessor, in the glorious Palace of Westminster.* It is near here that the bones of St. Edward still lie, beneath the Gothic vaults of Westminster Abbey.

"But while we compassionate the lot of those who are without, we shall not fail to lift up our hearts in grateful thanks to God, who without any merit on our side has so graciously placed us on 'the Rock' of Safety. We have signs enough from every quarter to cheer and to console; and amongst these, is there one more admirable or more cheering than the restoration of our long-lost Hierarchy? The very name chosen by our Holy Father for our Primal See is one of Catholic and happy omen. It was in the month of January in the year of our Lord 1066, the King of England, the Blessed Saint Edward the Confessor, lay sick of his last illness in his Royal Palace at Westminster; and, as it is related by Saint Ælred, Abbot of Rievaulx Abbey in Yorkshire, the holy King a little before his death fell into a trance, in which he beheld two pious Benedictine monks of Normandy whom he had formerly loved in his youth when an exile in that country. These monks foretold to the King what was afterwards to happen in England; they declared that the wickedness of the English nation was exceeding great, and that it provoked the wrath of God; but that when it should be come to the full, He would send in His anger a Mission of wicked spirits into the land, who should grievously punish it, and sever the green tree thereof from its stock, for the space of three furlongs distance, but that at length God would have mercy upon England, when this same tree should return again to its own root, without the help of any man's hand, and bear fruit and flourish. On hearing these words King Edward opened his eyes and awoke from his trance, and then related the vision he had seen to his Queen, St. Editha, who stood by his bed side, along with Harold, his successor, and Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury. This vision of our great and holy King St. Edward has ever been dear to the Catholics of England, and the interpretation given to it by our Catholic ancestors is very remarkable. They understood the Mission of wicked Spirits to signify that of the Protestant innovators, who in the sixteenth century pretended to reform the English Church. The cutting down and severing from its root the green tree signified the separation of the English Church from the centre of Unity, the Root of the Catholic Church, the Holy See, which had been in a special manner more than to most of the other nations the root and source of Christianity to England. But this tree was to be removed from its root for the space of three furlongs. This was explained to me by a venerable English Catholic Peer, now no more, to signify that England should remain severed from Catholic Unity during three centuries, after which, as the words of St. Edward testify, it will return again to its own Stock *without the help of any man's hand*, and bear fruit and flourish."

Mr. Ambrose Phillips, at the conclusion of this letter to Lord Shrewsbury (who is now on his way to thank the Holy Father for the spiritual boon he has accorded to the English Catholic Church), assures him that the Holy Father may count on all true Catholics for religious devotion to the cause he has at heart.

* History tells us that King Edward the Confessor had vowed to visit the tombs of the Apostles at Rome, but the Witan objected to his departure from England as long as he had no heir to the Crown. Pope Leo IX. having consulted (1049) the Council, absolved the King from his vow, but on the condition that the money which he had collected to defray the expense of his journey should be distributed among the poor, and that out of his yearly income he should found an abbey in honour of St. Peter. This commutation was accepted; the money was given in doles to the poor, and from that moment the tenth-part of the receipts from the King's manors was faithfully set apart for the foundation of the Abbey at Westminster. The monarch, previously to his decease, had the satisfaction of witnessing the dedication of the Abbey of Westminster, which had been the great object of his solicitude during his latter years. On the vigil of Christmas, 1065, he was attacked by the fever which ultimately proved fatal. For three days he struggled against the violence of the disease, held his Court as usual, and presided with affected cheerfulness at the royal banquets. On the festival of the Innocents, the day appointed for the dedication of the Abbey, he was unable to leave his chamber. The ceremony, however, was performed; Editha, his Queen, took the charge of the decorations, and represented the royal founder. But his absence, and the idea of his danger, diffused a deep gloom among the thousands who had assembled to witness the spectacle. After lingering a week longer, the good Catholic King died on January 5th, 1066, and was buried the following day, with royal pomp and universal affection, in the Abbey which he had erected.

GREAT EXHIBITION, 1851.

Just published, size of the Engraving, 18 in. by 10, printed on paper, size 21 in. by 14½,

GILBERT'S NEW PICTORIAL VIEW OF THE PALACE OF GLASS,

FOR THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, 1851,

With several Hundred Scenic and Characteristic Figures,

BEAUTIFULLY AND ACCURATELY DRAWN FROM OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, BY JOSEPH PAXTON, ESQ., F.R.S.

WITH STATISTICAL DETAILS

IN ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, SPANISH, AND ITALIAN.

The exciting interest which the Exhibition will create throughout the world has prompted the production of this carefully-executed, large, and very beautiful Illustration of the Exhibition Building; it is got up in the very first-rate style, printed on the best paper, and published at the extraordinary low price of 6d.; or 1s. coloured. The special object of its combined beauty, accuracy, and cheapness, is not only to command an enormous sale in the United Kingdom, but to induce our Merchants, Manufacturers, and all interested in this glorious Institution, to send this, by far the best and cheapest Illustration of the Building, to every part of the World. It may also be had in a neat gilt frame and glazed, price only 5s. (a truly beautiful household ornament), or stretched on frame and varnished, price 3s. Either of these two can also be had packed in deal boxes for safe transit by railway or other conveyance, at 1s. 6d. extra; or the 6d. and 1s. editions packed on roller for transit by post free at 8d. each extra.

GILBERT'S EXHIBITION LETTER- PAPER,

4to post size, of superior quality, with a beautiful Illustration of the Building. Price 34s. per ream; half-ream, 18s.; quarter-ream, 10s.; or with gilt-edges, 2s. 6d. per ream extra. This is recommended for daily use in every respectable family.

GILBERT'S EXHIBITION NOTE-PAPER.

Post size, superior quality, with a beautiful Illustration of the Building. Price 21s. per ream; half-ream, 12s.; quarter-ream, 7s.; or with gilt edges, 2s. extra. A very useful and tasty article.

GILBERT'S VISITORS' ILLUSTRATED MAP OF LONDON.

DRAWN ON A NEW PRINCIPLE,

Having in view the depicting of the principal Roads and Streets of the Metropolis.

With Illustrations of its most important Buildings and Sights,

ENGRAVED ON THEIR EXACT LOCALITIES.

This novel Map will be found an interesting, intellectual, and practical guide to all Visitors who may wish to proceed readily to the more important sights and attractions of London. The price, in sheet, will be 1s.; or in case for the pocket, 1s. 6d.

GILBERT'S EXHIBITION CARD,

With a View of the Building. Price One Penny.
Size, 4½ inches by 3.

GILBERT'S LARGE EXHIBITION CARD,

With a View of the Building. Price Twopence.
Size, 7 inches by 4½.

GILBERT'S GUIDE TO THE STREETS OF LONDON.

As a Companion to the Visitors' Illustrated Map.
WITH FIVE THOUSAND REFERENCES.
To enable the Visitor to find his own way throughout the length and breadth of the Metropolis. Price 6d.

GILBERT'S GUIDE TO THE GREAT EXHIBITION.

WITH NUMEROUS ILLUSTRATIONS.

The chief object of this book will be to give a pleasing and popular account of the scope and import of this gathering of the Industry of all Nations. It necessarily cannot be published much before the period of its opening; still it is with some degree of confidence hoped that this publication will be found highly calculated to deserve national encouragement.

GILBERT'S GUIDE TO LONDON.

WITH MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

This work, which is in full preparation for publication, is especially intend as a useful and indispensable pocket companion to every anticipated Visitor to the Metropolis during the Great Exhibition of 1851. It will be issued some time previous to the period, in order that all persons in the Kingdom may possess themselves of its instructive information previous to their visit. Separate Editions of the book will also be issued in the French and German Languages.

GILBERT'S MAP OF LONDON,

Beautifully Engraved on Steel,

WITH A KEY TO THE STREETS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Price, coloured and mounted in case for the pocket, only 1s., or sheet 6d.

The various Works specified above will be published for the Proprietors by

JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER-RROW, LONDON.

Orders received by all Booksellers, Stationers, and Newsvendors in the United Kingdom.

Foreign Orders will be executed by J. GILBERT on liberal terms; or they can be either sent to any Wholesale Bookseller or Stationer; or to any of the numerous Merchants and Manufacturers who export to all parts of the world.

It will be necessary, however, to order Gilbert's Editions, published at 49, Paternoster-row, London.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE,

AT ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, NOV. 2, 1850; AND

THE REV. DR. CUMMING'S LECTURE,

AT HANOVER-SQUARE-ROOMS, NOV. 7, 1850.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S CHARGE.

INTRODUCTORY.

REVEREND BRETHREN,—On this, the sixth occasion of my calling you together to hear the words of pastoral admonition and advice, I feel an unwonted degree of anxiety and difficulty in addressing you. Events have recently occurred deeply affecting the character and well-being of that branch of the Universal Church in which it is our privilege to minister, of such a nature that, while it is impossible for me to pass them over without notice, it is difficult so to speak of them as not to give offence in some quarters where I would not willingly awaken any feeling of displeasure. But looking to the present position of the Church, and to the uneasiness and disquietude which agitate the minds of many of its most attached and thoughtful members, I feel that I should be wanting to my duty if I did not declare my opinions with great plainness of speech; but, at the same time, I desire to do this in a spirit of gentleness and forbearance. May that Holy Spirit, whose office it is to teach God's faithful people, grant us to have a right judgment in all things, and especially in those which concern the peace of His Church.

I proceed at once to the most important of the questions upon which it will be my duty to touch; that which has arisen out of the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Courts in the case of Mr. Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter. I do not intend to enter at length into the history of those proceedings, nor into a minute examination of the judgment delivered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or, more properly speaking, the report made by them to her Majesty the Queen. But I feel myself bound to explain to the clergy of my diocese the reasons which induced me to withhold my approval of that report; and I am desirous of offering some suggestions as to the consequences likely to result from it, which I would hope may tend to quiet in some measure the minds of those who look upon it as in a high degree injurious, if not absolutely fatal, to the character of the Church, as the keeper and dispenser of God's truth.

THE GORHAM CONTROVERSY.

When, in obedience to her Majesty's commands, I attended the first meeting of the Judicial Committee, I had not read Mr. Gorham's published account of his examination by the Bishop of Exeter, nor was I aware of the extreme opinions which he had avowed. I went into the inquiry with the expectation of finding that he had not transgressed the bounds of that latitude which has been allowed or tolerated ever since the Reformation. Had such proved to be the case, I could have acquiesced in a judgment which, while it recognised that latitude, should have distinctly asserted the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, in the proper sense of the words, to be the doctrine of our Church. But having read, with great attention, Mr. Gorham's publication, I found that it contained assertions wholly irreconcilable, as it appeared to me, with the plain teaching of the Church of England and of the Church Universal in all ages.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have stated that Mr. Gorham's doctrine appears to them to be as follows:—"That baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism; that baptism is an effectual sign of grace by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it, in them alone it has a wholesome effect, and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace; that infants baptised, dying before actual sin, are certainly saved, but that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional." Had this been a full and accurate account of Mr. Gorham's opinions on this subject of baptism as set forth by himself, and had the reasoning, by which the judgment of the Judicial Committee is supported been omitted, in part at least, I might have felt less difficulty in assenting to the judgment. It certainly must be admitted that regeneration does not invariably take place in baptism, if such admission be limited to the case of unbelieving or impenitent adults, and that the grace is not so restrained to the rite, but that God may, if it so please Him, grant it separately from the rite, and that it is an effectual sign of grace to them only who worthily receive it; the question being whether all infants are worthy recipients; and lastly, that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional, the question being what are the conditions to be fulfilled.

But Mr. Gorham's assertions are not fully or adequately represented by the foregoing statement. His real errors, as I consider them to be, are of a more serious nature; being, as far as I can understand his language, not merely of a doubtful tendency with reference to the Church's doctrine, but precisely and dogmatically opposed to that doctrine. Those errors are passed over in silence by the Judicial Committee in their elaborate report to the Queen, a silence which is, in one point of view, satisfactory, inasmuch as, if it does not expressly condemn the errors in question, it certainly does not expressly vindicate nor in terms sanction them. "Mr. Gorham," says the Judicial Committee, "maintains that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism, that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism;

that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism." It is true, that Mr. Gorham asserts this in some of his answers; but in others he goes much further, and advances positions from which it follows as a necessary inference, not only that there may be cases in which infants are not regenerated in and by baptism, but that they are in no case so regenerated; that infants, duly baptised, may be regenerated, but that, if they are, it is before baptism, by an act of prevenient grace; and that so they come to baptism already regenerated; that forgiveness of sins, the new nature, adoption into the family of God, the being made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven," are benefits conferred on "worthy recipients," "not in baptism, but by an act of prevenient grace given by God before baptism;" so making them worthy recipients of the rite, that baptism is so far an effectual sign of God's grace bestowed beforehand, implanting a new nature, and strengthening and confirming faith in him. Thus, according to Mr. Gorham, the strengthening and confirming of faith is the whole of the spiritual grace bestowed in baptism, even on worthy recipients; faith, forgiveness of sins, regeneration, the new nature, and adoption into the family of God, have been all bestowed upon such, if at all, before baptism.

It did not appear to me possible to reconcile such statements as these with the plain and unequivocal teaching of the Church of England as to the nature of a sacrament. They seemed to me to be a plain denial of that which the Church asserts, that an infant is made in and by baptism (not before nor after it) a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. If there be any meaning in words, those statements are express contradictions of the truth that in a sacrament the outward and visible part, or sign, is a means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace, as well as a pledge to assure us thereof. If this theory of Mr. Gorham's be true, then is baptism no longer a sacrament according to the Church's definition, nor can we, with a safe conscience, continue to teach our children that Catechism which yet the Church declares is to be learned of every one of her members. It appeared to me, then, that these assertions of Mr. Gorham, which were passed over without notice by the Judicial Committee, but to which I could not shut my eyes, went to deprive holy baptism of its sacramental character, and utterly to evacuate its peculiar and distinctive grace. I am not now considering, nor was this the question before the Judicial Committee, whether Mr. Gorham's theory be defensible as being consistent with the language of Holy Scripture (which I am persuaded it is not), but whether it be agreeable to the dogmatical teaching of the Church of England; whether it can be reconciled with the deductions which she has drawn, in accordance with the primitive Church of Christ, from the word of God, the one infallible source of truth? Now, that baptismal regeneration, including in that term the remission of original sin in the implanting of a new principle of spiritual life, is indeed the doctrine of our Church, is, to my mind, so plain that I find it difficult to understand how any person can persuade himself of the contrary. I would repeat, with reference to this question, the observation contained in my charge delivered to the clergy of this diocese in 1842: "In the interpretation of the Articles which relate more immediately to doctrine, our surest guide is the Liturgy." It may safely be pronounced of any interpretation of an Article which cannot be reconciled with the plain language of the offices for public worship, that it is not the doctrine of the Church. The opinion, for instance, which denies baptismal regeneration might possibly, though not without great difficulty, be reconciled with the language of the 27th Article. By no stretch of ingenuity nor latitude of explanation can it be brought to agree with the plain, unqualified language of the offices for baptism and confirmation. A question may properly be raised as to the sense in which the term "regeneration" was used in the early Church and by our own Reformers; but that regeneration does actually take place in baptism, is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English Church; and I do not understand how any clergyman who uses the office for baptism, which he has bound himself to use, and which he cannot alter nor mutilate without a breach of God's faith, can deny that, in some sense or other, baptism is indeed "the laver of regeneration."

I cannot for a moment admit that the Articles contain the whole doctrine of the Church of England. "The Book of Articles," says Bishop Pearson, "is not, nor is it pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explication of all Christian doctrines necessary to be taught, but an enumeration of some truths which, before and since the Reformation, have been denied by some persons who upon their denial are thought unfit to have any cure of souls in this Church or realm." It was argued by Mr. Gorham's counsel that the Book of Common Prayer is to be considered simply as a guide to devotion, not as defining any doctrine; but it appears to me to be a perfectly inadmissible supposition, that, in a solemn act of devotion, and especially in the celebration of a sacrament, any point of doctrine should be embodied as a certain and acknowledged truth, about which the Church entertains any doubt. This would surely be nothing short of addressing the Author of Truth in the language of falsehood. On the contrary, the assumption of a doctrine as true, in a prescribed form of prayer or thanksgiving to God, is, in fact, the most solemn and positive assertion of that doctrine which can possibly be made. Will any one maintain that if the articles of religion had contained no direct declaration of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, it would not have been expressly and most solemnly asserted by the Church when she directed her members to pray to the "Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three persons and one God," or that because the special work of the Holy Ghost in the economy of man's salvation, that of renewing him in the inner man, is not in terms asserted in the Articles; it is, therefore, not asserted by the Church when she instructs us to pray, that having been regenerated and made the children of God, by adoption and grace, we may be duly renewed by His Holy Spirit?

I do not understand how any clergyman can doubt whether the Liturgy is binding upon him in respect of doctrine, when he remembers the solemn declaration which he has made in the face of the Church: "I do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in the book entitled 'The Book of Common Prayer.'" Not only, you will observe, his consent to use it, but his assent to everything contained in it. Again, it is prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, that every lecturer shall openly declare his "assent unto and approbation of the said Book (of Common Prayer); and to the use of the Prayers, &c., therein contained and prescribed"—words which are quite incompatible with the notion that nothing more is required of the clergy than to declare their readiness to use the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. Waterland, speaking of the case of Arian subscription, says of Dr. Samuel Clarke: "He was sensible that Articles, Creeds, and Liturgy, must all come into account, and all be reconciled (if possible) to his hypothesis. He made no distinction between the *truth* of this and the *use* only of that, well knowing that truth and use are coincident in a case of this high moment, and that he could not submit to the use of these prayers but in such a sense as he thought true."

But all doubt as to the bearing of the Book of Common Prayer upon questions of doctrine, at least

with regard to the sacraments, is removed by the express language of the Canons. The 57th Canon distinctly and authoritatively refers to the Book of Common Prayer as declaring what the doctrine of the Church is with respect to the two sacraments. "The doctrine," it says, "both of Eaptism and the Lord's Supper, is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at administration of the said sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary." This is a direct assertion that the baptismal and eucharistic offices are dogmatic, as well as devotional, and were this authoritatively declaration wanting, we should protest against the notion that, in the most solemn act of prayer and thanksgiving to God, our Church should have permitted herself to employ the strongest and most unqualified words, without intending them to be understood in their natural sense. This Canon, indeed, says no more than had been said by Bishop Ridley, in his "Last Farewell," written just before his martyrdom: "This Church of England had of late, the infinite goodness and abundant mercy of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true and sincere word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's holy sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same, taught in the holy Catholicism to have been learned of all true Christians." I need not consider the comparative authority of the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer in questions of doctrine. We are bound to admit the truth of both documents. If there be anything which wears the semblance of contradiction or diversity between the two, we may be sure that the framers of the Articles did not intend it; and, with respect to the two sacraments, the express declaration of the Canons put forth fifty years after the publication of the Articles, is decisive as to the point, that they are to be interpreted in accordance with the plain language of the offices in the Book of Common Prayer. If there be any ambiguity or want of precision in the Articles as to the effect of baptism, it is, I think, our obvious duty to have recourse to the office for the administration of that sacrament, for the purpose of ascertaining the Church's mind on so important a point of doctrine.

THE CHURCH'S VIEW OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

It is not my intention to discuss at length the meaning and force of the 27th Article, nor would I deny that its language is less precise than that in which many other doctrinal questions are stated and determined; but I cannot believe that, if there be anything ambiguous in that language, such ambiguity was intentional, and studiously employed for the purpose of leaving the construction of that Article to the private persuasion of individuals, considering that the purpose for which the Articles were designed was stated to be "the avoiding of diversities," not merely in teaching, but of "opinions." Moreover, if there be some obscurity in the language of the 27th Article, when taken by itself (an obscurity which ceases to exist when that part of the article which relates to the baptism of adults is distinguished from that which concerns infant baptism), there is none when it is read in connexion with the 25th, which declares the sacraments to be "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good-will to us, whereby he doth work invisibly in us." Therefore baptism is an effectual sign of grace, that is, a sign producing the effect which it represents, and by baptism God doth work invisibly in us. I could refer you also to another of the Articles, which seems to me very clearly to indicate the sense of those who framed them as to the spiritual effects of baptism: I mean the 19th Article, "Of sin after baptism." It says:—"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is a sin against the Holy Ghost, and therefore unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again and amend our lives." It appears to me to be an unavoidable inference from the Article that its framers considered the recovery of the Holy Ghost to be uniformly an effect of baptism, where no bar existed on the part of the recipient; and this inference is rendered certain by the language held by Cranmer in 1538. "Because," he says, "infants are born with one original sin, they have need of the remission of that sin; and that is so remedied that its guilt is taken away, albeit the corruption of nature or concupiscence, remains in this life, although it begins to be healed, because the Holy Spirit is efficacious even in infants themselves, and cleanses them." The precise nature and extent of the spiritual change which then takes place, the Church has no further defined than by the general assertion that it is a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, and that every person rightly baptised is made thereby a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. This change is otherwise expressed by the single word "regeneration."

I suppose that few amongst us will be found to deny that all who receive baptism worthily are, in some sense of the term, therein regenerated. The Church declares in very general and positive language, of all who, having been duly baptised, are afterwards brought to be confirmed, that Almighty God has vouchsafed to regenerate them by water and the Holy Ghost, and has given them forgiveness of all their sins. But this declaration, it is said, is to be restricted to such as have received baptism worthily; and this raises the question whether *all* infants may receive baptism worthily. What is the *obex* or bar which in any case disqualifies an infant from the worthy reception of that sacrament? Actual sin it cannot be. Original sin, or inherited sinfulness of nature, is the only bar which can be imagined. But to remedy the consequences of this original sin is the very object of baptism. It is therefore so far from being a bar to the receipt of that sacrament that it is the very reason for its administration. "Nothing," says Bishop Pearson, "in the whole compass of our religion, is more sure than the exceeding great and most certain efficacy of baptism to spiritual good; that it is an outward and visible sign indeed, but by it an invisible grace is signified, and the sign itself was instituted for the very purpose that it should confer that grace."

"One baptism for the remission of sins." If this *credendum* of the Universal Church be true, how can we admit the truth of an assertion that original sin must be remitted by a previous act of grace before an infant can be worthy to be baptised? The 9th Article, "Of original or birth sin," declares that in every person born into the world, this sin "deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate; and although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptised (in the Latin it is *remotis*), yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." Words cannot more clearly convey the notion that original sin is forgiven to them that are regenerate, that is, to them who believe and are baptised, although its infection still remains in the lust of the flesh. And this, let me remark, by the way, points out the great difference in point of doctrine between the Church of Rome and our own as to the effect of baptism. The one contends

that not only the guilt, but the very essence and being of original sin, is removed by baptism; the other teaches that although the guilt is forgiven in baptism, the corruption of nature remains even in those who are so regenerate. This notion of the Church of Rome lies at the root of its grand error, that of justification by inherent righteousness. I am aware that a question has been raised whether that clause of the Nicene Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins," has any reference to the forgiveness of original sin. But what other reference can it have in the case of infant baptism, which we know to have been the practice of the Universal Church when that creed was compiled? In truth, no question was raised about it till Pelagius denied the doctrine of original sin. The writings of his great opponent, St. Augustine, abound with passages which prove the belief of the Church Catholic to have been that original sin was remitted *in* baptism, not *before* or *after* it. That remission in baptism of the guilt of original sin, for the sake of the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ (Christ being the meritorious cause of their remission, baptism the instrument), is also the doctrine of our own Church, following in this, as in other respects, the teaching of the early Church, cannot reasonably be doubted. It is plainly asserted in the Catechism, prayed for in the office of baptism, and made a subject of special thanksgiving both in that and in the office of confirmation. Nor is it less distinctly set forth in the homilies, from which the following extracts may suffice:—"We must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after baptism, if we truly repent, and unfeignedly turn to Him again." . . . "Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully or idly after that we are baptised or justified." . . . "We be, therefore, washed in baptism from the filthiness of sin, that we should live afterwards in pureness of life."

The same language was held by Cramer, Ridley, Latimer, Becon, Hutchinson, Bradford, following the steps of Luther and Melancthon, all of whom taught that remission of sin and the gift of the Spirit were the effect of baptism. That this doctrine was held by our greatest divines is so notorious as almost to render citation unnecessary. "Baptism," says Hooker, "is a sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church to the end that they who receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life." With this plain and comprehensive statement of the beneficial effects of baptism may be coupled another from the same great luminary of the Church, which, although it does not in terms specify the forgiveness of original sin, necessarily includes it. "We take not baptism nor the eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before [which is Mr. Gorham's theory], but as they are in deed and verity, for means effectual whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands the grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." And in a passage immediately following that which has been quoted to show that Hooker considered the Church to speak of infants baptised only as the rule of "piety alloweth us both to speak and to think," we find this statement, plainly showing that he believed all infants to receive regeneration by baptism, whether they be elect or not. Cartwright, whom Mr. Gorham follows, had spoken of a grace that makes a man a Christian before he comes to receive baptism in the Church; and Hooker says:—"When we know how Christ in general hath said that of 'such is the kingdom of heaven, which kingdom is the inheritance of God's elect, and do without behold how His providence hath called them unto the first beginnings of eternal life, and presented them at the well-spring of new birth, wherein original sin is purged—besides which sin there is no hindrance of their salvation known to us, as themselves [Cartwright and his party] will grant—hard it were that, having so many fair inducements whereupon to ground, we should not be thought to utter, at the least, a truth as probable and allowable in terming any such particular infant an elect babe, as in presuming the like of others whose safety, nevertheless, we are not absolutely able to warrant." He then goes on to say that "baptism implieth a covenant or league between God and man, wherein as God doth bestow presently remission of sin, and the Holy Ghost, binding also himself to add, in process of time, what grace soever shall be further necessary for the attainment of everlasting life, so every baptised soul receiving the same grace at the hands of God, tieth likewise itself for ever to the observation of His laws."

The question, you perceive, of which Hooker speaks, is not whether this or that infant is regenerated in baptism, but whether, being regenerated, it can also be certainly pronounced elect. The early Calvinistic divines, who held the doctrine of election, predestination, and perseverance, never doubted, on the one hand the certainty of baptismal grace, nor, on the other, its defectibility. "The ancient predestinarians," says the present Bishop of Bangor, "never questioned the certainty of regeneration in baptism, because this doctrine was consistent with their theory; for though they maintained that the elect, or predestinate, are endued with the gift of perseverance unto the end, and will finally be saved, yet they believe that God bestows at his pleasure every other kind and measure on those persons from whom He withholdeth this special grace of perseverance. They therefore held in common with the rest of the Church, that forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, are bestowed in baptism; nor did they imagine that there is any necessary or indissoluble connexion between regeneration and eternal salvation." Two names scarcely less illustrious than that of Hooker, are those of Barrow and Pearson. The former speaks of "each member of the Church singly being, in holy baptism, washed from his sins and made regenerate, or adopted into the number of God's children, and made partaker of Christ's death." The latter declares it to be "the most general and irrefragable assertion of all to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins, whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the baptism of the same person." The settled opinions of the early Lutheran divines, as well as of Luther himself, are apparent from the "Loci Theologici" of Gerhard, a text-book of Lutheran theology. "Infants," he says (I quote Mr. Arnold's translation), "do not resist the Holy Ghost and His operation, and therefore faith and salvation are undoubtedly conferred upon them." Again: "They detract from the efficacy of the sacraments on the side of defect . . . who argue that the sacraments are only signs of grace either already conferred and received without the use of sacraments, or not to be conferred till some later time. Zuinglius, especially, had disseminated this error in his writings." But this is precisely the error of Mr. Gorham.

With these testimonies before me, I could not bring myself to admit that Mr. Gorham's theory of the comparative, if not the absolute, inefficacy of baptism could be reconciled with the language of our authoritative formularies, according to any just rule of interpretation. It appeared to me that he went to much

greater lengths in depreciating the sacramental character of baptism than any writer of our Church with whose works I was acquainted, except the opponents of Hooker—that he left far in the background those who maintained the hypothetical, the conditional, or the charitable theory of baptismal efficacy, in his assertion that in all cases the forgiveness of original sin, the grace of regeneration and adoption into the family of God, are not the effects or results of baptism, but of a preventient act of grace, where a baptised infant possesses them, or of a subsequent act of grace, where they follow at some later time after baptism.

Let me add one word on the subject of preventient grace. It has been well observed that the supposition of preventient grace in the case of infants only shifts the difficulty one step backwards; for if infants be not qualified to receive baptismal grace, how can they be qualified to receive preventient grace? If their being born in sin unfits them for the one, so must it for the other. The preventient grace of which some of our older divines have spoken refers to the baptism of adults, who must be predisposed by the Holy Spirit to seek for the benefits of baptism, and enabled to believe with the heart unto righteousness.

Suffer me also to offer a remark upon the notion that the efficacy of baptism in some measure depends, in the case of infants, upon the faith and prayers of those who offer them at the font, that the sacrament is more or less efficacious as the parents who present their children to be baptised are more or less alive to the solemn importance of the rite, and more or less earnest in prayer for its complete and final effects. Not to dwell on the consideration that, if this notion be true, it seems to exclude from the spiritual benefits of baptism all children of wicked or thoughtless parents, I must confess that it seems to me somewhat akin to the error condemned in our 26th Article, viz., that the unworthiness of the ministers hinders the effect of the sacrament, and the answer appears to be nearly the same in both cases—"That the effect of Christ's ordinances is not taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, and although they be ministered by evil men." The Church considers the efficacy of the sacraments to depend upon Christ's institution and promise—the fulfilment of which depends upon their right administration and worthy reception—and surely an infant's fitness to receive baptism cannot depend upon the feelings of those who present it. In the case of an adult this is perfectly clear. That the ultimate effect of baptism may depend in some measure upon the faith and prayers of parents and sponsors, none will be found to deny; and this consideration cannot be too forcibly urged upon those who present their children at the baptismal font, and upon those who superintend their education. But this is a very different thing from making the immediate effect of the sacrament to depend upon the prayers of those who are present at its administration. To those men who hold this notion, I would recommend the following remark of the truly pious and charitable Archbishop Leighton; it is contained in a letter published in his select works. "To your other point touching baptism?—truly, my thought is, it is a weak notion taken upon trust almost generally to consider so much or at all the qualifications of the parents. Either it is a benefit to infants or it is not. If none, then why administered at all? But if it be, then why should the poor innocents be prejudged of it for the parent's cause, if he profess but so much of a Christian as to offer his child to that ordinance? For that it is the parent's faith gives the child a right to it is neither clear from Scripture nor any sound reason; yet, in that, I heartily approve your thought, that you would make it, as it more fitly may be, an inducement to the parents to know Him and His doctrine and live conformably to it, under whose name they desire their children to be baptised."

It is obvious to remark that much of the controversy which has so long (and, unhappily, with so much of acrimony on both sides) been going on respecting the effect of baptism has arisen from the different meanings in which the word regeneration has been employed. It is greatly to be desired that some agreement should be come to as to the sense in which it is used by the Church. If this were done, I believe that the differences between contending parties would, in many cases, be found to be really much less than they appear to be. I do not venture to give a precise definition of what is meant by the word regeneration, but I would offer a suggestion which may pave the way to a common understanding. I need hardly remind you of the different passages of Holy Scripture in which a man is said to be born of water and of the Spirit; to be born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God; to have been begotten again of God; to be born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible; to have been begotten again of God unto a lively hope; to have been born of God, and to sin not; to have been begotten of God, and to keep himself. Now, he who is born becomes thereby the son of him to whom he is born, by whom he is begotten; and, therefore, to be born of God, or begotten of God, means to be made a child of God; and regeneration, or the being born again, means that a person is made the child of a father whose child he was not before. Regeneration by baptism means, then, the being made, by baptism, a child of God, and with reference to God's no longer regarding him with displeasure, but with favour, a child of grace. So in the Collect for Christmas-day, we are spoken of as being regenerate, and made the children of God by adoption and grace. It is obvious that this regeneration carries with it remission of sins, as the Church prays that the "infant coming to holy baptism may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration;" and afterwards thanks God "that it hath pleased him to regenerate that infant, to receive it for His own child, by adoption, and to incorporate it into His holy Church." So far, I apprehend, many will be found to agree with us as to the nature and effects of baptismal regeneration, who will, perhaps, draw back or hesitate when we proceed one step further, and maintain that such a change of state necessarily implies the conferring of some inward spiritual gift upon the subject of it.

Now, it is surely unreasonable to suppose that where there is a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, there will not be given the principle of a new life of righteousness; that where obedience is required there should not be imparted what Bishop Jeremy Taylor calls "a capacity obediential." As the first or carnal birth carried with it the principle of bodily life, so the second or spiritual, conveys the principle of spiritual life. "Being engrafted into Christ or His Church," says Bishop Wilson, "we receive grace and a new life from Christ as really as a branch receives life and nourishment from the good tree into which it is grafted." In this sense, as well as with reference to the general resurrection, it is true that "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." We cannot conceive of God that He should freely receive into His family, by adoption, those who are washed with the laver of regeneration, removing thereby the bar of original sin which rendered them, as long as it continued, incapable of salvation, without giving them, at the same time, such a portion of His Holy Spirit as may enable them to take the first steps in the path of eternal life. As regeneration itself is the work of the Holy Spirit, we may be assured that the grace which regenerates will not desert him whom it has regenerated. I do not see how

His can be denied by those who suppose an infant to undergo in baptism such a moral change as fits him for admission into the kingdom of heaven. But this surely is a very different thing from that moral change which must take place in the adult Christian, who is invested with personal responsibility, and capable of seeking for or resisting the influences of the Holy Spirit. The regeneration which we believe to be the effect of baptism in no way lessens the necessity of conversion of spiritual renovation in those who fall from the grace so given, nor of continual efforts on the part of all to be so renewed and strengthened by the Holy Spirit as to be enabled finally to accomplish that work of which baptism is but the beginning. On the contrary, they furnish the strongest imaginable motives to vigilance and self-examination, and earnest prayer for larger and larger measures of grace. We do not hold that the inward grace given in baptism is indefectible, but that they who have been once regenerate, may "depart from grace given, and fall into sin." We believe that the grace so given is an initial and seminal grace, which must be cherished and developed, and made fruitful by proper culture and training, and by a diligent use of all the means of spiritual improvement which God has given us in His Word, His Church, and His Sacraments. Not only is the first imparting grace necessary, but growth in grace is required, in order to the final efficacy of our baptismal privileges; and so the Church prays that the infants whom it has pleased God to regenerate with His Holy Spirit, and to receive for His own children, by adoption, may afterwards "crucify the old man and utterly abolish the whole body of sin." And at confirmation she beseeches God that He will "daily increase in them His manifold gifts of grace," and that they may "daily increase in His Holy Spirit more and more."

Upon the whole, I am of opinion that the real doctrine of our Church, as to the effect of baptism, is correctly stated in the following words of one of the most learned of her sons, Bishop Beveridge:—"Although our Blessed Saviour saith to Nicodemus, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, yet He doth not say that every one that is so born shall inherit eternal life. It is true that all that are baptised or born of water and the Spirit are thereby admitted into the Church or kingdom of God upon earth; but except they submit to the government and obey the laws established in it, they forfeit all their right and title to the kingdom of heaven. They are brought into a state of salvation, but unless they continue in it, and live accordingly, they cannot be saved. Baptism puts us in the way to heaven, but unless we walk in that way we can never come thither. When we were baptised we were born of water and of the Spirit, so as to have the seed of grace sown in our hearts sufficient to enable us to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit to overcome temptations to believe aright in God our Saviour, and to obey and serve Him faithfully all the days of our life. But if we neglect to perform what we then promised, and so do not answer the end of our baptism by keeping our conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, we lose all the benefit of it, and shall as certainly perish as if we had never been baptised." Or I might adopt, as a still shorter expression of the Church's mind, the language of a late learned and judicious prelate, Bishop Van Mildert:—"They who agree with our Church understand by regeneration that first principle of holiness—that beginning of the spiritual life of which baptism is not only the sign but also the pledge—assuring us of its actual conveyance. Thus far, and thus far only, they extend the meaning of spiritual regeneration, and this they maintain to be given in baptism. The ultimate efficacy of the gift they acknowledge to be dependant upon our subsequent growth in grace." This doctrine is briefly and touchingly summed up in the collect already referred to:—"Grant that we, being regenerate and made thy children by adoption and grace, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit."

Those persons who charge the maintainers of what we believe to be the true doctrine of baptism, with the error of the Church of Rome touching the *opus operatum*, appear not to understand clearly what that error is. I cannot do better than quote the words of the present learned Bishop of Bangor, to show what the real difference is, in this respect, between the two Churches:—"That baptism is the ordinary means through which God bestows the grace of regeneration, is a doctrine common to our own Church and to the Church of Rome. But the point on which our divines insisted, in opposition to the decrees and teaching of that Church, was that this grace is not communicated to or contained in the element, and from thence transferred to the soul, of the recipient; that the outward sign is only an instrumental, the Holy Spirit the efficient cause of regeneration; that it is not the water but the blood of Christ with which our sins are washed away; that the object of faith in the sacrament of baptism is not any virtue contained in the water, but the promise of God in Christ; and that the necessity of baptism, when it may be had, depends not on any supernatural quality communicated to the element of water, but on the positive commandment and institution of Christ. It should be remembered that a canon of the Council of Trent anatomises those who affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify."

Before I dismiss this subject, I would desire you to consider whether the vague and uncertain notions respecting baptism which have prevailed in the Church during the last one hundred years, have not, in a great degree, been owing to the careless and irregular administration of the sacrament itself—the office mutilated; the font thrust into a corner, out of sight of the congregation; the directions of the rubric and canons disregarded; the definitions of the Catechism unexplained. I cannot but think that if the Church's orders with respect to the administration of baptism had been always and everywhere duly followed out—had the people been accustomed to hear the solemn and affecting form by which their children were, or ought to have been, grafted into the body of Christ's Church, and to bear a part in it themselves—had the baptismal covenant been more carefully and systematically put forward in the teaching of the clergy, in connexion with all the duties of after-life—the ordinance of baptism would have been better understood and more highly valued; the Church's intention would have been less a subject of doubt, and extreme opinions on either side would have found less acceptance. And this leads me to remark that, deplorable as are the present divisions in the Church on the baptismal question, we may see some reason to be thankful that any question of a purely religious nature should have excited so wide and deep a feeling in the nation at large. I cannot but regard it as an indication of the growth of religious knowledge and principle in the people of this Christian country, when I see them taking so lively an interest in an inquiry respecting an article of faith; but at the same time, it may well suggest to us the necessity of caution and charity, lest this awakened feeling should be hurried into either extreme—of superstitious reverence for outward forms, or a puritanical contempt of them. The thorough examination of the question before us cannot fail to issue in the establishment of the truth; but that desirable result may be retarded, and it will certainly be attained at the expense of much detriment to the cause of true religion, if the examination be conducted in a bitter and censorious spirit, and if anything of personal feeling be mingled with that love of truth which

ought to be the guiding principle of all controversy: we may not abandon nor compromise what we believe to be the truth, but we may let it be clearly seen that in our endeavours to establish it, we are actuated by a desire not to obtain a victory over our antagonists, but to bring them to an agreement with us; or, if the truth lie on their side, to come to an agreement with them. Nor is it to be forgotten that, although the truth can only be one, there may be various shades of error, more or less detrimental to the integrity of Christian doctrine—more or less obstructive of the ends which all doctrine is intended to produce; and it is to the attainment of these ends that we should direct the minds of our people, rather than to differences of opinion, which are not likely to weaken the foundation of their faith, nor to impair the motives to practical piety and holiness of life. But I can hardly extend this liberty to those, if such there be, who teach their congregations to undervalue the importance of a sacrament, its privileges, or its obligations.

PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DECISION OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

I now proceed to offer some remarks upon the consequences which may be expected to follow from the judgment grounded on the report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

In the first place I consider that the error of Mr. Gorham, which I have already pointed out, and which I hope is almost peculiar to him amongst the clergy of our Church, has not been sanctioned by the Judicial Committee. It has been overlooked by them—at least they have passed it by without notice. Those opinions of Mr. Gorham, which they have sanctioned, do not go to the extreme length of separating the grace of baptism from the sacrament, nor of denying “one baptism for the remission of sins.” The notions which they have stated as those which are to be collected from Mr. Gorham’s examination are vague and indefinite, and involve the necessity of putting an interpretation upon the plain language of the Church other than its natural sense. The sanctioning of this principle of interpretation seems, it must be admitted, to open the door to an almost unlimited latitude of teaching upon the most important points of doctrine. But still the report of the Judicial Committee does not contain a distinct approval of what I consider to be the great error of Mr. Gorham’s theory—the absolute severance of the inward and spiritual grace of the sacrament from the outward and visible sign. So far it leaves untouched the sacramental doctrine of the Church. But, suppose it were otherwise; suppose that the Judicial Committee had even gone to the length of sanctioning so grave an error as this, would such a decision have really affected the character of our Church as a teacher of God’s saving truth, and a dispenser of His holy sacraments? I think not. It might indeed, have exposed her in its consequences to the danger of being so affected at some future time, and to that danger, as one which may possibly follow, even from the recent judgment, we must not close our eyes. But let us bear in mind that it is not, properly speaking, the Church’s act—that it does not alter a single sentence or word of her Creeds or Formularies—that it does not exempt any one of her ministers from the necessity of subscribing to her Articles in their “plain, literal, and grammatical sense,” nor give them liberty to change or omit a single word of those offices, in which her orthodox doctrines are embodied, and enunciated, and applied to practice. This is, indeed, an invaluable advantage possessed by the Church in her Book of Common Prayer: that it is a standing confutation of erroneous doctrine—a stated proclamation of Christian truth continually resounding in the ears, and carried home to the hearts, of all her members, and made familiar even to the most unlearned. As long as we retain unaltered our Book of Common Prayer, I do not think that we have much to fear from the diversity of opinions which may from time to time arise in the Church. A clergyman may sometimes preach strange doctrines to his people, but he must also formally contradict them as often as he reads the Liturgy in his Church; and the people in general are so habituated to its plain, simple, forcible enunciations of Scripture verities, in the most affecting form, that of direct addresses to the Author of all Truth, that an occasional misinterpretation of them on the part of the preacher will not often loosen the foundations of their faith, nor rob them of the consolation which the Church’s offices are so well adapted to impart. I am much inclined to agree with the late Mr. Alexander Knox, who, as we learn from Bishop Jebb, “considered the Liturgy a much stronger fence to the Church than subscription to the Articles.” The latter was a single act, to which a man might argue down or persuade his scruples. But no Arian who had a grain of religion or honesty could persist, week after week, in reading the Creeds. But, to return to the question more immediately before us, I would again urge the consideration that the teaching of the Church is still to be found in its Creeds, Formularies, and Articles, not in the decisions of any Court, even the highest which is constituted for the purpose, not of making or altering laws, but of enforcing them. I admit that a series of erroneous judgments upon any important point of doctrine might have the effect of practically nullifying the Church’s own assertion of it; but I still maintain, that this is a defect in the discipline of the Church, which requires, indeed, correction, but which does not, in principle, affect her doctrine. Until the decrees and canons in which that has been embodied are altered; until her solemn assertion of the truth in her Liturgy is silenced by her own act, and by virtue of her own synodical movement—the Church cannot be said to have given up any one feature of her system of doctrinal truth, nor to have ceased from asserting it.

The highest judicial tribunal has no authority to alter one word of the formularies in which the Church has deliberately enshrined her belief: that can only be done by the Church herself, duly represented in Convocation. For this reason I do not consider that we stand in need of any fresh synodical declaration on the subject of baptism. The Church’s language is sufficiently plain in her Articles, Catechism, and Offices; and to attempt a more precise and stringent definition, at this time of day, would be equivalent to an admission that she had hitherto left a most important point of Christian doctrine undetermined and uncertain. Besides, I should fear that if any attempt were made to obtain such a definition, it would open the door for an endeavour to tamper with the Book of Common Prayer, especially with the offices for baptism and the holy communion. If some persons are of opinion that any one of the Articles is not sufficiently explicit on the doctrine of either sacrament, others think that the Liturgy expresses the sacramental principle too strongly; and it is easy to imagine what disputes and confusion might arise, if the expediency of rendering the Articles more, or the Liturgy less dogmatical, were to be made a subject of synodical debate. On this question I retain the opinion which I expressed sixteen years ago, in the words of the Rev. J. Newton:—“As to our Liturgy, I am far from thinking it incapable of amendment; though when I consider the temper and spirit of the present times, I dare not wish that the improvement of it should be attempted, lest the remedy should be worse than the disease.” Of the attempts which would probably be made to strip our Common Prayer of its characteristic excellences, we may form some notion from the proposals already put forth by those who call for its reformation, and who would expunge from it

the Athanasian Creed, the assertion of baptismal regeneration, some of the rubrics in the office for the Holy Communion, the reference made in the preface to the ordinal to "ancient authors" as testifying to the existence of the three orders of the ministry in all ages of the Church, and many other portions of the Liturgy. Should the time ever unhappily come when such concessions shall be made, it will not be long before our venerable and scriptural Liturgy is replaced for the second time by a "Directory for the public worship of God."

In thus stating my apprehension of the consequences which might be expected to follow from any attempt to obtain a synodical revision of the Book of Common Prayer, or an explanation of any of the Articles, I would not be understood to express an opinion unfavourable to the removal of those restrictions which now hinder the Church from deliberating in her collective capacity upon questions of doctrine or discipline. In theory, and by her legal constitution, she possesses that right, but in practice she is restrained from exercising it. That restraint is no sufficient ground for renouncing her communion, but it may well be thought a fit subject of complaint; and its removal may be sought for by all legitimate methods. It may be doubted whether the actual constitution of Convocation is the best that could be desired: it may be questioned whether the Church should not be represented by a body consisting of lay as well as of clerical members; but even as Convocation at present exists, some questions might safely be entrusted to its consideration, nor should it be forgotten that the Crown can at any moment interfere to stop its proceedings, if they should transgress the rules of equity or of charity. But this subject is too large and difficult to be fully considered on the present occasion.

PROPOSED NEW COURT OF APPEAL.

With respect to the desirableness of substituting a new Court of Appeal, in suits involving questions of heresy, for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, I think it unnecessary to trouble you with any observations. My reasons for thinking such a change advisable were fully stated in a speech recently delivered in the House of Lords, and since published. The attempt then made to obtain the consent of Parliament to a change in the constitution of the present Court of Appeal was not successful, but we need not on that account forbear from renewing it, nor despair of its ultimate success. It is on all hands agreed that some change is necessary; our object must be to obtain the sanction of the Legislature to such a change as shall be in accordance with the essential principles of the ecclesiastical polity. Those principles, I would remind you, remain unchanged. The law of the Church, whatever defects we may perceive in its administration, continues essentially the same. There is much in the actual state of things to excite our apprehension and to keep alive our vigilance; but the difficulties which surround our Church, far from affording to any of her members a sufficient reason for deserting her, and renouncing her communion, seem to me to require from them an increased degree of affection and dutiful obedience, and a more united and determined resistance to her adversaries.

RECENT SECESSIONS TO ROME.

With respect to those persons who have lately seceded from us, and passed over to the Church of Rome, it is manifest that the recent decision of the Judicial Committee, although it may have been made the pretext, cannot have been the cause, of their secession. A supposed misinterpretation of the Church's mind upon a particular point of doctrine by a court of law can hardly be regarded, by the commonest understanding, as a sufficient reason for renouncing her communion, and embracing all the errors, both of doctrine and practice, which the Church of Rome imposes upon the reason and conscience of her members; for it must be borne in mind that it is not simply a question whether that Church asserts any particular point of doctrine more precisely and dogmatically than our own, but whether its whole system be such as to represent more clearly and more fully the true faith and pure worship of God. Whoever desires to be in communion with the Church of Rome, must be prepared to embrace that system in all its fullness and complexity—every item of all the errors and superstitions which have at any time received the sanction of Papal infallibility, and not only so, but every new doctrine or practice which the same authority may from time to time impose upon the Church.

It is not easy to say what the members of that Church are required to believe now—it is impossible for them to foresee what they may be called upon to admit as an article of the faith next year, or in any future year; for instance, till of late it was open to a Roman Catholic to believe or not, as he might see reason, the fanciful notion of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, which had been opposed by some of the most eminent divines of his Church, and purposely left undecided by the Council of Trent. But the present Bishop of Rome has seen fit to make it an article of the faith, and no member of his Church can henceforth question it without denying the infallibility of his spiritual sovereign, and so hazarding, as it is asserted, his own salvation. Suppose that the teaching of our own Church as to the effects of baptism were less clear and definite than it is, leaving to her ministers a greater latitude than is actually left to them by the recent judgment, would that justify any one of her members in throwing himself into the arms of a Church which teaches, and now more openly than ever insists upon, his paying divine honours to a creature? Is Mariolatry a less sin, or less a departure from the truth, than a low view of baptismal regeneration? Is a belief that the grace of God is not tied to the outward and visible sign in a sacrament—a more pernicious error than the assertion that the priest's *intention* is necessary to the efficacy of a sacrament? If the former notion be calculated to raise a doubt whether this or that infant be made by baptism a Christian, is not the other much more so? No man in the Church of Rome, who is bound to admit its doctrine respecting the priest's *intention* in administering the sacraments, can be sure whether he is a Christian or not. This one dogma of that Church is more calculated to raise doubts and scruples in the minds of her members than any uncertainty which is supposed to exist in any of the Articles of our Reformed Church. This line of reasoning might be pursued at greater length with reference to the various corruptions of Gospel truth, the belief of which the Church of Rome binds upon the consciences of all her members as necessary to salvation. But I must content myself with the general observation, that he who deserts the Church in his baptism on account of some one supposed flaw in her system of discipline, or even of doctrine, and submits to an authority which demands an implicit belief in an indefinite number of dogmas, opposed alike to Scripture and to common sense, some impious and some absurd, may be compared to a man who, having observed some instance of doubt or hesitation in his guide, in order to avoid mistaking the path on one side, rushes blindfold over a precipice on the other.

But there is another very important consideration suggested to us by the recent lamentable secessions from our Church. It may well occur to us to inquire how far the way may have been paved for them, in

some instances at least, by the growth of opinions and practices in our own Reformed Church, at variance, if not with the letter, yet with the spirit, of its teachings and ordinances. I am unwilling to condemn, without reserve, the motives of those amongst the clergy who have thought themselves at liberty to imitate, as nearly as it is possible to imitate, without a positive infringement of the law, the forms and ceremonies of the Church of Rome, or to insinuate without openly asserting some of the most dangerous of those errors which our own Reformed Church has renounced and condemned. I am bound to do justice to their zeal and devotedness—their self-denial and charity. Inconsistent as I think their conduct has been with their duty to the Church of which they are ministers, I cannot suspect them of intentional heresy. They may, perhaps, have thought they were adopting the most likely method of retaining in our communion persons of warm imagination and weak judgment, who were in danger of being dazzled by the meretricious splendour of the Roman ritual, or deluded by the false pretences of the Roman system of doctrine to antiquity and unity. If such has been their object, they have been grievously disappointed. Concessions to error can never really serve the cause of truth. If some few have been thus retained within the pale of our Church, many others have been gradually trained for secession from it. A taste has been excited in them for forms and observances which has stimulated without satisfying their appetite, and they have naturally sought for gratification in the Church of Rome. They have been led, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice, and then, to the surprise of their guides, have fallen over. I know that this happened in some instances. I have no doubt of its having happened in many. Then, with respect to doctrine; what can be better calculated to lead the less learned or the less thoughtful members of our Protestant Church to look with complacency upon the errors which their Church has renounced, and at length to embrace them, than to have books of devotion put into their hands by their own clergymen, in which all but divine honour is paid to the Virgin Mary? A propitiatory virtue is attributed to the eucharist; the mediation of the saints is spoken of as a probable doctrine; prayer for the dead urged as a positive duty, and a superstitious use of the sign of the cross is recommended as profitable; add to this the secret practice of auricular confession, the use of crucifixes and rosaries, the administration of what is termed the sacrament of penance, and it is manifest that they who are taught to believe that such things are compatible with the principles of the English Church, must also believe it to be separated from that of Rome by a faint and almost imperceptible line, and be prepared to pass that line without much fear of incurring the guilt of schism.

ROMANISING INNOVATIONS IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Then, with regard to the mode of celebrating Divine worship; it has been a subject of great uneasiness to me to see the changes which have been introduced by a few of the clergy, at variance, as I think, with the spirit of the Church's directions, and, in some instances, with the letter. It has always been esteemed an evidence of the wisdom and moderation of those who framed our Common Prayer, that they retained such ceremonies as they thought best to the calling forth of God's honour and glory, and to the inducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition, putting away other things which they perceived to be most absurd, "as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries." But this principle has been lost sight of by the persons to whom I allude, and they have presumed, following their mere private judgments, and not the rules or intention of the Church, to introduce, one by one, those very forms and observances which the reformers of our Liturgy had purposely discontinued and laid aside, but which it is now sought to revive, some of them for the first time since the Reformation. These innovations have, in some instances, been carried to such a length as to render the Church service almost hifionion. I really cannot characterise by a gentler term the continual changes of posture, the frequent genuflections, the crossing, the peculiarities of dress, and some of the decorations of churches to which I allude. They are, after all, a poor imitation of the Roman ceremonial; and furnish, I have no doubt, to the observant members of that Church, a subject, on the one hand, of ridicule, as being a faint and meagre copy of their own gaudy ritual, and, on the other hand, of exultation, as preparing those who take delight in them to seek a fuller gratification of their taste in the Roman communion. I am by no means insensible to the value of the aesthetic principle in the externals of religion, but great caution is requisite not to lay such stress upon that which is material and emblematic as to detract from the importance of that which is purely spiritual: to substitute, in fact, the mere machinery of religion for the effects which it is intended to produce. I have always contended, and still contend, that we are bound to carry out all the Church's directions for the celebration of Divine service; but I contend also, that we offend against her order, not less by the addition of what it forbids or does not enjoin, than by the omission of anything that it prescribes.

Suffer me to remind you of the language which I held to you on this subject eight years ago. "Such practices," I observed, "which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies and expressive forms, which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to His holy name. In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materialising religion, and, above all, we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the sacraments which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus himself." In 1846 I again complained of the efforts which had, for some time past, been systematically made to revive amongst the members of our communion opinions and practices usually regarded as peculiar to the Church of Rome, and spoke of them as tending to perplex and unsettle sensitive and imperfectly-instructed consciences, and to prepare them for an acknowledgment of the paramount authority of that Church, which, as it concedes nothing, nor admits the possibility of its erring, even in the minutest feature of that complicated system, which was stamped with the character of unchangeableness by the Council of Trent, has manifestly a great advantage in dealing with unstable and doubtful minds, whenever one step has been taken in advance towards that system. I had hoped that these distinct expressions of my opinion would have the effect of checking the innovations alluded to, and of awakening those of the clergy of my diocese who had departed the furthest from the simplicity of our reformed ritual to a sense of the danger of all endeavours to assimilate it to the Roman ceremonial, and to the inconsistency of such endeavours with their own obligations, as ministers of our Reformed Church, bound by solemn pledges to observe her rules, and to carry out her intentions. That expectation has been disappointed; neither my public exhortations nor my private admonitions have produced the desired effect. I have been

told that I had no authority to forbid anything which was not in express terms forbidden by law; and that practices which, though properly laid aside by the Church, and so by implication condemned, have not been actually prohibited, are therefore lawful, and that canonical obedience to a bishop is only that which he can enforce in a court of law; and so the innovations which I have objected to have been persisted in, with additional changes introduced from time to time, with the manifest purpose of assimilating the services of our Reformed Church as nearly as possible to those of the Roman. Once more I declare my entire disapproval of such practices, and my earnest wish that, while every direction of the rubric and canons is observed where it is possible, no form should be introduced into the celebration of public worship which is not expressly prescribed by them, or sanctioned by long-established usage.

It is a duty at all times incumbent upon the members of our Reformed Church, especially upon her ministers, to abstain from everything which may seem in any way to countenance the errors of the Church of Rome, and lead any person to believe that the difference between us is less than it really is; to forbear from imitating its peculiarities, from recommending its books of devotion, from attending its services, even through curiosity, in this country at least; in short, to shun all intercourse with it as a Church. But this duty presses upon us with peculiar force at the present time, when that Church is advancing its pretensions to spiritual dominion amongst us with an arrogance hitherto unknown.

AGGRESSIVE MOVEMENTS OF THE PAPACY.

It has been thought sufficient by all former Popes, since the time of the Reformation, to provide for the spiritual care of their adherents in this country by the appointment of Vicars Apostolic, exercising, indeed, episcopal authority over them, not as Bishops of any English See, but deriving their titles from some imaginary diocese, in *partibus infidelium*. The assertion now first made of the Pope's right to erect Episcopal Sees in this country appears to me to be, not only an intentional insult to the Episcopate and clergy of England, but a daring though powerless invasion of the supremacy of the Crown. The Act of Parliament which restored that supremacy provides that "No foreign prince, person, prelate, State, or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall use, enjoy, or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence, or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm;" and although, while the law in this respect remains unaltered, the pretended erection of a Bishop's See in England, by the Pope's authority, can have no legal effect, it is manifestly the assertion, on his part, of a right to do that which the laws of England have forbidden. I cannot, therefore, but regard it as a measure against which, not only the Church, but the Government, of this country is bound emphatically to protest. It is evident that the Bishop and Court of Rome entertain very sanguine hopes of the conversion of this country, and of its return to the bosom of their Church. The sad falling away of some, who seemed to be the most devotedly attached to the Church of England, has awakened expectations, not unnatural, indeed, but destined to certain disappointment.

I believe that the very boldness of the pretensions now put forth by the Bishop of Rome and his agents will prevent their success. They may dazzle and confound a few weak minds, or captivate some ardent imaginations, but they will be instinctively repelled by the common sense and right feeling of the people at large. Popery, as demanding an entire prostration of men's intellect, before an authority which attempts to substantiate its claims, not by proofs, but by gratuitous and inconsistent assertions, cannot long retain its hold upon the mind of a well-educated people imbued with a knowledge of Holy Scripture. Its fundamental principle is, that men are not to examine, but to believe; and, at the present moment, by the re-assertion of superstitions, which the more learned writers of the Romish Church have long ago exploded, and by the revival of legends, suited only to an age of the grossest ignorance, it seems to be pushing that principle to its very utmost length, as though its maxim were, that the more incredible doctrine or history may seem, the more merit there is in believing it. And this fearless contempt and defiance of common sense has its effect upon some uninformed and humble minds, overpowering them by the very audacity of its pretensions, while the authority which displays it offers to relieve them from all the trouble and anxiety of a search after truth, assuring them that it is at once their duty and their happiness not to inquire, but to believe. But the Church of Rome employs different agencies and instruments to different classes of men. For those whose education and habits of mind require something like argument and evidence, she has her subtle dialecticians and persuasive orators, who do not fetter themselves with a very strict adherence to the canon of doctrine laid down by the Council of Trent, but insinuate, if they do not expressly teach, various modifications of it, adapted to remove what they term the prejudices of their Protestant hearers, especially of those who are members of the Church of England. You will readily understand me to allude to the Oratorians, as they are called, and I name them principally for the sake of expressing my earnest hope that none of you will give the least countenance to their proceedings, nor run the risk of impairing the strength of your own convictions, and of weakening your attachment to the Church of which you are members, by attending any of their services or listening to their lectures.

INJURIOUS TENDENCY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.

But, while we are looking to the dangers which impend over us in one quarter, let us not close our eyes to those which threaten us from another. A natural principle of antagonism in the human mind makes it probable that some who fly off from Popery will traverse the entire diameter of the rational sphere, and be landed on the antipodes of infidelity. I would desire you to consider whether some of those persons who are disgusted with the departures now too common from the soberness and simplicity of our devotional offices, and with the exaggerated notions which are insisted on as to the authority of the priestly office, are not too likely to take refuge, not in Low Church doctrine, as the term is commonly understood, but in the boundless expanse of Latitudinarianism, a sea without a shore, and with no pole-star to guide those who embark on it but the uncertain light of human reason. I cannot but think that we have more to apprehend from the theology of Germany than from that of Rome; from that which defies human reason than from that which seeks to blind or stifle it; from a school which labours to reconcile Christianity with its own philosophy, by stripping the Gospel of all its characteristic features, and reducing it to the level of human systems, than from a Church which rejects and condemns even the soundest conclusions of true philosophy when they are at variance with the determinations of its own presumed infallibility. The theology, if it deserves the name, to which I allude, has been grafted upon, or grown out of, the idealism of the German philosophers. It has exhibited symptoms of decline in its native soil, but I fear it is beginning to lay hold on the more practical mind of this country, and from it, in my judgment, more danger is to be apprehended than from the attempt to revive worn-out superstitions, and to shackle

the understandings and consciences of men with fetters which were broken and thrown off at the Reformation. Moral evidence, historical testimony, inspiration, miracle, all that is objective in Christianity, is swept away by the writers of this school, its glory defaced, its living waters deprived of all their healing virtues by distillation in the alembic of rationalism.

Now, I fear that there are many persons who think that they may safely go to a certain length with these bold adventurers in theology, with out following them into all their extravagant speculations; for instance, that they may deny the inspiration of Holy Scripture, as the Church understands it, without calling in question the evidences—that is, the historical evidences of Christianity; that they may believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and yet cast off what they term a superstitious reverence for the text of the Bible. But I do not believe it to be possible for any one thus to undervalue and weaken the authority of the Apostles and Prophets, and so to undermine the foundations of his belief, without impairing the soundness of the superstructure, and diluting his faith in Jesus Christ as the chief corner-stone. To deny the inspiration of Scripture is one step towards the rejection of the Gospel as a revelation from God.

Against this fatal heresy I would earnestly caution my younger brethren, as being one from which, in the present state of the human mind, we have much more to fear than from the encroachments of Popery. Rationalism, as its name implies, referring everything to man's unaided reason as the ultimate test of truth, flatters the pride of his nature, which is revolted by the humbling but consolatory doctrines of the Gospel. Popery offends and disgusts the understanding by inventions opposed alike to common sense and to the plain letter of Holy Scripture. The latter aims at the complete subjugation of the intellect to the authority of the self-constituted Vicar of Christ; the former asserts the supremacy and infallibility of reason. It is manifest that this is most likely to find favour with a trained and scientific generation, while the former can rest its hope of general acceptance only on the ground of an uninquiring ignorance. The true safeguard and preservative from both extremes is to be found in the general diffusion of sound scriptural knowledge by means of education—in a sedulous inculcation of the doctrines of our Reformed Church, as drawn from the inspired Word of God, and in a firm adherence to the Creeds, and Liturgy, and Articles. If these be cast aside, or if, while they are subscribed to in the letter, they are understood and interpreted in a non-natural sense, so as to explain away, on one side, the fundamental truths of Christianity, or, on the other, the distinctive doctrine of Protestantism, we shall soon be afloat in a sea of error, drifting helplessly amongst the shoals and quicksands of heresy, old and new. The Church will no longer be an ark of safety; its ministry will be a ministry not of peace but of confusion; and what the results will be we may learn from the example of the Continental Churches, which are now reaping the bitter fruits of their defection from the Catholic truth and order, and of their separation of religious from secular education.

And what is the lesson which the actual condition of our own Church is calculated to teach us? Menaced by dangers of opposite kinds—on this side superstition and spiritual tyranny, on that side Rationalism, with infidelity and Pantheism in its train—are we not bound to put away from us, as far as our duty to the truth will permit, all dissensions and controversies between ourselves, to rally round the vital truths of the Gospel, and to study with much self-inquiry and earnest prayers to realise our Saviour's precept—"Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another?" Whatever defects we may believe to exist in the constitution of our Church, as viewed in connexion with the civil polity of this country, let us devote our energies more resolutely than we yet have done to the fulfilment of our own individual duties as ministers of that Church, each in his proper sphere of action, and we shall find in the more rapid growth of true religion, in the extension of the Church's boundaries, in the daily in-gathering of those who are to be saved, and in the moral and social improvement of the people at large, abundant evidence of our belonging to a true Church.

Nay, have we not even now sufficient evidence of this kind to assure and encourage us? Can we believe that God would bless the efforts of a fallen or falling Church with such success as by His goodness has already crowned the awakened energies of our own? And is not the very fact of that awakening, viewed in connexion with its results, in itself a condemnation of those who desert our Church because she is hindered, as they think, from doing her proper work? Is it too much to say that the Divine Head of the Church (we speak with humility) seems to be acknowledging the legitimacy of that branch of it which is planted in this realm by repeated marks of His favour; not by amplifying its worldly honour, nor by enlarging its endowments, nor by augmenting its temporal power, nor by giving it increased favour in the sight of legislators and rulers, but by calling forth its spiritual energies, by reviving its inner life, by rekindling in its members somewhat of the Church's ancient warmth of piety and charity, by giving it both the will and the power to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, and to break forth on the right hand and on the left? Have we not thankfully to acknowledge the goodness of God toward the Church of this country in permitting it to send forth, within the last ten years, fifteen additional bishops to preside over its distant and too long neglected branches, and in blessing the labours of those devoted and self-denying men with an almost unlooked-for measure of success? This, too, be it remembered, by the Church's inherent energy, without assistance, almost without encouragement, from the State. Again, are there no indications of the existence of a true Church, faithful to her appointed work, in the efforts which have been lately made to bring into her bosom and to provide with heavenly nourishment the multitudes of perishing sinners, called indeed by her name, and for the most part, it may be, made her children by baptism, but from that moment treated as strangers and foreigners, ignorant of her maternal care, and suffered to remain in an almost worse than heathen state? Are not the churches and schools, which are now so many centres of light and holiness in regions where the powers of darkness long held undisputed sway, so many trophies which the Church militant has been permitted to erect over the enemies of man's salvation? Is it not the Church which has of late lifted up her voice, and told the rich and powerful of the duties they owe to the poor, and of the dangers which have arisen, and of the ruin which must ensue, from the continued neglect of those duties? Let us, dear brethren, be duly thankful to God for all that He has guided and enabled our Church to effect, as the dispenser of His truth, and be more zealous and more united than ever in our endeavours to carry on that work in our respective spheres of duty. Let us rally, as dutiful sons, round our spiritual mother in the time of her distress and perplexity, repair the breaches of our Zion as effectual as God may permit us to repair them, and possess ourselves in patience and prayer, till in His own good time. He shall see fit to perfect the work.

SISTERHOODS OF MERCY.

There are still other topics which seem to require some notice from me, but I can only touch upon them very briefly.

The question of establishing Sisterhoods of Mercy in our Reformed Church, is one respecting which opinions are greatly divided. That such institutions may be productive, under due regulation, of much good, cannot, I think, be doubted. They have from time to time been recommended to our Church for adoption by writers whose attachment to the principles of the Reformation cannot be doubted. They were, in fact, originally Protestant institutions. Eighty years before the formation of Sisterhoods of Mercy in the Church of Rome by Vincent de Paulo, the Protestant Sisterhood of Sedan, and the ladies of Rochelle, set the example of those associations for pious and charitable objects. That it is possible to conduct them in accordance with Protestant principles is proved by the institution of deaconesses established in Paris in 1841, and carried on with continually increasing success under the truly paternal care and wise direction of M. Vermeil, Pastor of the Reformed Church of Paris. In a few years a spacious house, containing 127 rooms, with large yards and gardens, has been purchased and fitted up, and is filled with sufferers of every description. Instruction for the young, consolation and guidance for penitents, medicine and attendance for the sick, a lending library, the distribution of Bibles and tracts—all these objects are carried out or superintended by the deaconesses and probationers, and these useful labours have been thankfully acknowledged from time to time by pecuniary grants from the municipal authorities of Paris.

This institution has from the first been carefully guarded from the errors and abuses of the Church of Rome. It has associated together Christian women constrained by the love of Christ, and desirous of being permitted to do His work more effectually than would be done by their detached and isolated efforts. But it has held out to them no inducement nor facilities to desert the duties laid upon them by their domestic relations. No vow of celibacy nor engagements binding their consciences—no violation of the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free—the character of the establishment is not that of a monastic community, but of a great Christian family. If any Sisterhoods can be formed in this country answering to this description, I should hail their institution as calculated to increase the efficiency of our Church, and to strengthen it against the machinations of Rome. But I strongly deprecate the establishment of any religious or charitable society of females which shall have almost every peculiarity of a nunnery but the name. I fear that this is the case with some which have been already formed. I have reason to believe that, in more than one instance, young women have been encouraged or permitted to enrol themselves as Sisters of Mercy or Charity, against the earnest wish of their nearest relations, and to neglect one clearly prescribed duty for the sake of undertaking another, which is certainly not of positive obligation. I should think it a sufficient condemnation of such an institution to be able to show that in any one instance its conductors had invited or permitted a daughter to become an inmate in spite of the earnest remonstrances of a father or a widowed mother. From these objections the Training Institution for Nurses is free; and I do not deny that more extensive establishments of the nature of that which exists at Paris might be formed in strict accordance with the principles of our Reformed Church. All that I intend to say is, that greater care is requisite to avoid the fault of monastic institutions than appears to have been exercised in some instances which have come to my knowledge.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

The question of national education is one which, on this occasion, I must pass by with a simple remark. After all the discussions which have taken place with regard to the intentions of the Government, and the duty and claims of the Church, I am persuaded that if the education of the people at large be taken out of the hands of the clergy, it will be mainly their own fault. They stand on a vantage-ground from which, if they are vigilant and active, it will hardly be possible to dislodge them. But they must take care that the education which they offer is one which deserves the name, one adapted to the present state of human knowledge and of human society. On this subject I retain the opinion which I stated in my charge of 1834. It was, therefore, with great pleasure that I gave my sanction to a plan suggested by some of the London clergy, and carried into effect by themselves, with the assistance of several lay members of the Church, of giving evening lectures on different branches of literature, art, and science, to the young men of London, with a view to their improvement, moral, intellectual, and spiritual; affected as they are by the peculiar temptations of a great city, the modern practice of early closing, and the advancing spread of knowledge. The benevolent efforts of the committee have been crowned with a large measure of success; they have now commenced the first term of the third year with forty-eight classes in seventeen different parishes, and numbering about eight hundred students, most of them clerks or shopmen in commercial houses, some Scripture-readers, and some national schoolmasters. It is scarcely possible to estimate too highly the good which this measure is calculated to produce. Its moral and social effect is to be calculated, not merely by the improved tastes and habits of the students themselves, but by the influence which they will exercise upon those around them, their fellow-clerks and shopmen, their families and acquaintances.

THE GREAT EXHIBITION OF 1851.

One other subject remains to be noticed before I conclude. The Great Exhibition of Works of Art and Industry, which has been announced for the year 1851, will cause an unprecedented influx of strangers into this metropolis from all parts of the world, but especially from the Continent of Europe. It is for others to consider in what manner that vast multitude is to be provided with lodgings and the conveniences of life. It is merely a duty incumbent upon the ministers of the Gospel to devise, if possible, some mode of furnishing them with the means of worshipping God, and of profiting by the opportunities of the Christian Sabbath. Let us not welcome them to this great emporium of the world's commerce as though we looked only to the gratification of our national pride, or to mutual improvements in the arts, which minister to the enjoyment of this present life, and took no thought of the spiritual relation which subsists between all mankind as children of God, whom he desires to be saved through Jesus Christ. Let us not incur the guilt of Hezekiah, who displayed to the Chaldean messengers the house of his precious things, the silver, and the gold, and the spices, and the precious ointment, and all the house of his armour, and all that was found in his treasures; but forgot, as it seems, to set before them the glory of the true God, and the beauty of holiness in His law, and in His worship, and the history of His wonderful works. It may not be easy to mark out the precise line of duty which we ought to follow in this matter, or to devise any plan which may be equally applicable to persons of different languages and creeds; but we should endeavour to provide for them the means of common worship, and to distribute amongst those who may be willing to receive it, the Bible, and, where it may be done the Book of Common Prayer, translated into the

language of their respective countries. I cannot doubt but that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge will lend its aid towards the fulfilment of this design. Whatever measures of success may attend our endeavours, they will at least serve to convince our guests, that we are not mere worshippers of Mammon, that we are not entirely absorbed in the pursuit of mere objects which concern only the present life, but that we glory in possessing ourselves, and are desirous of imparting to others, the unsearchable riches of Christ.

DUTY OF THE CLERGY—CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, reverend brethren, I would again suggest to you that the most likely method of healing the wounds inflicted upon the Church by our intestine divisions—of softening that asperity of feeling which religious controversy is so apt to engender—and of bringing us by degrees to a common understanding upon questions of vital importance—is for every one of us, in his proper sphere of action, honestly to fulfil the duty laid by the Church upon all her ministers. See that you never cease your labour, your care, and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all that are or shall be committed to your charge unto that agreement in the knowledge and faith of God, and that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no room left among you either for error in religion or for viciousness of life. I cannot but think, that if every clergyman were to direct all his energies and endeavours to the task of feeding the Lord's family with the wholesome food provided for them in the Bible and the Church, to the instruction of the ignorant and the conversion of the sinful with earnest prayer—the study of God's word, and a devout and punctual observance of the Church's rule, confining his efforts, except in special cases, to the field of labour which has been assigned to him, he would do more to tranquillise and strengthen the Church than he could effect by stepping out of his allotted station to enlist himself in the ranks of angry polemics, under other banners than those of the Church herself, unfolded by the authorised standard-bearers. There are three promises which you have all made before God, and in the face of His Church, when you were invested with authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister His holy sacraments, which, taken together, and with a due regard to their bearings upon one another, will furnish you with a perfect rule of conduct in times of perplexity and disquiet. Suffer me to remind you of them. The first—"Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word?" "I will, the Lord being my helper." The second—"Will you maintain and set forward, as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among those that are and shall be committed to your charge?" "I will so do, the Lord being my helper." The third—"Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgment?" "I will so do, the Lord being my helper." Whatever dangers may threaten us from without, if there be amongst us a spirit of firm adherence to the scriptural doctrine and apostolical order of our Church, of mutual candour and kindness, and of cheerful obedience to legitimate authority exercised within reasonable bounds, a zealous devotion to our Master's work, and a simple reliance upon Him for the will and the power to perform it, He will assuredly bless and protect His Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Now, unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end.—Amen!

DR. CUMMING ON THE ROMISH AGGRESSION.

The Rev. Dr. Cumming having engaged in prayer,

The CHAIRMAN said he regretted that so many persons should have been put to such inconvenience by the great pressure; but it was an occasion which indeed called for all their energies, and he rejoiced to see that the spirit of true Protestantism was so stirred up in our land. (Cheers.) An event had occurred which threatened disastrous consequences to our country, and to that which was the sole foundation to our prosperity—our national Church and religion. The Pope of Rome—the man of sin—the head of the apostacy—the head of that system which was designated in the Scriptures as the ministry of iniquity, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and the abomination of the earth, had had the boldness and audacity to insult our Queen, our Church, our religion, and our laws; and they were called upon not to yield for one moment in submission to such an assumed authority as that. (Cheers.) The Cardinal Archbishop who had been appointed to begin the work had lost no time in commencing his mission. He had asserted that all spiritual jurisdiction in that country belonged to the Pope, and that he would govern in that country until the Holy See should be pleased to appoint another. That was the presumption with which Dr. Wiseman had begun his work. They were called upon to meet that effort. The society to which he was attached, and at whose request Dr. Cumming had undertaken the lecture he was about to deliver, had been endeavouring for a long period to excite the Protestant feeling in Great Britain, and to warn the inhabitants of the stealthy but rapid progress of Popery. They had not been able to succeed, but what they could not do the Pope had done for them; and he rejoiced at that, because he knew that it was only for Protestants to be aware of their danger to insure their victory and success. They had the power of truth upon their side, and they had the sword of the Spirit, which, when wielded in complete dependence upon the power of the Lord, never would be wielded in vain. (Cheers.) There was a certainty of success if there were a certainty of exertion. (Cheers.) He trusted, therefore, that this was only the beginning of numberless efforts to accomplish that which they ought to have done long ago. (Loud cheers.) He hoped that the clergy of this country would be stirred up to exert themselves, and that they would consider as their parishioners every Roman Catholic as well as every Protestant, and would seek to win them to the knowledge of God's truth. It was peculiarly gratifying to him that one had had his eyes opened to the present danger who had hitherto been ignorant of it—he meant their diocesan, the Bishop of London. (Cheers, and a hiss.) He rejoiced that their diocesan had not only renounced Popery, but that also which was still worse—that great pest which was stalking through our country, and was now called "Puseyism." (Tremendous applause.) He rejoiced that the bishop had called upon his clergy to fight against the inward enemy as well as the outward opponent, and he trusted that his call would be responded to throughout the country. (Cheers.) There was only one fear he would express—lest the excitement, which was now coun-

nderable, should die away. They must recollect that the work was to be carried on with perseverance; and they should come to a solemn resolution that they would exert themselves in every way to root out Popery from the land and to establish the Protestant religion supreme and all-powerful in this country. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. CUMMING then presented himself, and was received with great applause. He commenced by expressing his gratitude to God that the popularity of Dr. Wiseman had brought together so large a number to protest against his innovations in this land. (Cheers.) He could not do better than commence the lecture which he had been asked to deliver by reading what he thought to be one of the most memorable documents that had proceeded from any official authority at any period or under any crisis in the history of our land. He alluded to that noble, Protestant, and faithful letter addressed by Lord John Russell to the Bishop of Durham—(great cheering)—a document, he confessed, such as he had expected from his Lordship, believing his principles to be as they were there so eloquently and justly embodied, and a document which only just gave a crowning blow to the mighty and successful efforts that had been made by the metropolitan daily press to appreciate the crisis, and to arouse the sympathies of Protestants against this invasion. (Cheers.) It was perhaps altogether superfluous to read his Lordship's letter, but one part of it he could not but look at with delight—his Lordship said, "I confess, however, that my alarm is not equal to my indignation." (Loud cheers.) And he added that the present state of the law should be carefully examined, and the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumption of power deliberately considered. He (Dr. Cumming) did not doubt that that would be done, and such a sentiment came with greater grace from that distinguished nobleman, who had advocated what were called the claims of 1829, than it did from those who had been despised as false prophets at that time, but who were now found to be faithful and true, who did not think that that measure was so desirable as some supposed. (Cheers.) "Clergymen of our own Church," added Lord John Russell—and he believed that this explained much of the secret of the invasion: for he need not tell them that even the cholera itself did not strike its victim unless there were a contaminated air to act as its conductor; and Dr. Wiseman, who personated a moral and spiritual pestilence, would never have been dropped in the midst of us if it had not been represented to the Pope that the atmosphere was morally tainted, and that he might expect to meet with no little success—(cheers)—the Premier said therefore, "Clergymen of our own Church who have subscribed the XXXIX. Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, 'step by step, to the very verge of the precipice.' The honour paid to the saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, the muttering of the liturgy, so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his charge to the clergy of his diocese." (Cheers.) Now, having alluded to that letter, he begged to state that, in addressing them that day, he had no pretensions to greater acumen than thousands of his brethren in London; but he had felt that there was a possibility of the tide which had set in with such strength and force running in the wrong direction, and that it was just possible they might, in their hatred of this gross invasion, fly into the extreme of renewing pains and penalties, or of engaging in a persecuting political course, which he conceived would be attended with no great practical advantage. He had no personal hostility to his Eminence the Cardinal, as he assumed to be, of Westminster. Cardinal Wiseman was a distinguished scholar, a most accomplished scientific writer, and any one who was acquainted with his works upon science and religion would be ready to own that he was a scholar of the very highest order in that particular department; but his being a perfect scholar afforded no proof that he need therefore be a perfect theologian and a true Christian. It was possible to know every star that shone in the firmament, and yet be ignorant of the bright and morning star; it was possible to know all the stores that were in all the golden mines in the universe, and yet to be ignorant of the unsearchable riches of Christ; it was possible to know every flower that beautified the garden, and yet to know not the Rose of Sharon; it was possible to have all the knowledge of all the encyclopedias in the world, and yet to be ignorant of that which even the Sunday scholar knew—the answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?"—"Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Cheers.) He had no desire, on the other hand, to interfere with the rights and privileges of his Roman Catholic countrymen. Dr. Wiseman had as great liberty to tread the soil and to breathe the air of Old England as the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. He did not wish to deprive him of his civil rights and privileges; but he protested that, while Dr. Wiseman was entitled to all the rights of citizenship, he had no right, at the dictation of a foreign Prince, to parcel out Old England into Popish dioceses, and to claim all baptised men as the subjects of his power. Dr. Wiseman was a Cardinal—that was, a temporal prince; and if a foreign temporal prince meddled with the rights and privileges and governance of our Most Gracious Sovereign, judging from the letter of Lord J. Russell, and from the mettle and temperament of our countrymen, he would meet with that resistance which would tell him how great a blunder his master had perpetrated. (Cheers.) He treated Cardinal Wiseman now as a minister of the Gospel, himself teaching certain doctrines; and he wished to ascertain, by sober analysis, whether Westminster would be very much benefited by getting rid of the ministers that now instructed it, and superseding them by his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. But whatever his conduct might be, they must be careful not to tread in the least degree upon the verge of what might be considered persecution; for he believed that persecution had never yet recovered a convert, and never yet made a convert. If the sword were to be unsheathed, let it be by the friends of the Cardinal, and not by the friends of the Protestant Church. If the faggot were to be kindled, let it be by Pio Nono and not by those who had learned a more excellent lesson; for if they persecuted, they might depend upon it that men's sympathy with the victim made them forget the deadliness of the error he preached, and they would only retard the end they had in view. (Cheers.) On the other hand, he asked them not to sympathise with those who wished to treat the Cardinal on what they termed mere ecclesiastical grounds. There was a class who said, "We won't send a bishop of Rome to preach Protestantism there, and we ask the same from you." He confessed if Protestantism were what the Pope designated it—a deadly heresy, and if Popery were what Cardinal Wiseman contended it was—a great truth, the Pope had done an act of great kindness in sending a Cardinal missionary to instruct us. But if the case were the very reverse, he could not sympathise with that compact which said to the Pope, "You keep your bishops in Austria, Italy, and Spain, and we will keep ours in England, Ireland, and the realms of her Majesty." He warned them, in whatever they had free trade, to have none with Popery; to have no bargains—no compromise with the Pope of

Rome. They must protest against him and his principles as their fathers had done, conceding indeed the largest husk of prejudice, but not yielding the smallest living seed of vital Christianity. (Cheers.) Again, the Pope having ignored the Protestant Church, and stated that it was not a Church at all, and that its ministers were not ministers at all, he wondered that any one should have expressed surprise at this phenomenon. Incidentally, however, this was worthy of remark. In the year 1848 a great convulsion shook almost the whole globe, certainly Europe, to its very centre. It would be found, on examination, that in Rome there was an ecclesiastic, of some sort or another, to every 30 persons, and that there was a priest for every 60 or 70. He argued, therefore, that if the doctrine of the Church of Rome was so precious, it had a most splendid opportunity of bearing its fruits in what was called the capital of the Christian world; so if Popery had failed in Rome, it had not been from the want of hands to work it, or priests to represent it, but from some inherent faults within it. On the other hand, looking at London, there was not a minister of any denomination for every 10,000 of the population, and it might, therefore, be justly argued, if Protestantism had failed in London, that it was from the simple fact that it was not adequately represented and efficiently carried out. But what were the facts? When that revolution shook Europe in 1848, the subjects of the Pope, in that model city of the world, whose people being at head quarters might be presumed to be the holiest in the world, whose contiguity to the papal chair should have made them, *par excellence*, the most spiritual, holy, devout, loyal, and perfect persons, rose *en masse*—his beloved subjects, his own dear metropolitan people, his own pet representatives of what Popery made people, murdered his Prime Minister before his face, dismissed himself in a footman's livery upon a coachman's box, and, judging by the facts that since transpired, were the last people to wish him back again. (Cheers and laughter.) The same wave that swept over Europe swept the metropolis of Old England. A few of the Cardinal's pioneers (?) began to disturb us with their crotchets and to agitate. And what was the result? Why, England rose in one body, lined every street, put down the crotchets of the troublesome, and rallied round their hearths and homes, ready to live for their Queen and to die for their religion. (Cheers.) If Protestantism made us so loyal, it was worth keeping; and if the Cardinal's crotchet failed to make his own pet people loyal (?), it could be hardly worth preserving. Their controversy, however must not be that of person against person—it was not that of Church against Church, but it was a controversy of light against darkness, of freedom against slavery, of the rights and privileges of our country against the attacks and assaults of Rome. It was the glory of our blessed Lord against him who sat in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God. The rev. gentleman then proceeded to notice at great length, and by reference to numerous authorities, what was the teaching of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and of the Romish Church—a portion of the lecture which we are compelled considerably to abridge. In the first place, when the Cardinal was made archbishop and received the *palium*, he repeated a solemn oath in Latin, which was to be found in the *Pontificale Romanum*, and which, being translated, is as follows:—"All heretics (that was Protestants) and schismatics (that was the Greek Church) I will prosecute and attack to the utmost of my power (*pro posse*)." The following was a curse the Cardinal was to use if a parent attempted to remove a child who had, against his parent's will, entered the service of the Church:—"May he be cursed in his home and out of his home. May he be cursed in watching and sleeping; in eating and drinking—walking and sitting. May his flesh and bones be corrupted. May there light on him the curse which the Lord sent by Moses. May his name be razed from the Book of the Living," and so on. Such was the declared cursing of Cardinal Wiseman, as printed in his own document, and which, when he had the *pro posse*, he would pronounce with all the accompaniments. The Doctor then proceeded to show what was the actual teaching of Cardinal Wiseman; and as he had highly recommended for the study and guidance of the priests of his diocese the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori, who was canonised by the proclamation of the Pope in 1839, Dr. Cumming quoted largely from the works of that worthy. St. Alphonsus said that the scriptures and books of controversy might not be printed in the secular tongue; but let them not suppose, therefore, that Cardinal Wiseman denied the use of the Bible to the people. Oh, no. He allowed the French peasant to have it in Dutch, the Dutch in Russian, and the Russian in Hebrew—in fact any language they liked that they didn't understand (?). (A laugh.) Another doctrine was that for a good cause it was lawful to use equivocation, and to enforce that equivocation with an oath. Let them bear that in mind when reading Dr. Ullathorne's letter to the *Times*, in which he had denied everything. Again, a confessor could affirm, even with an oath, that he did not know a sin that had been communicated to him in confession. Again, said Liguori, approved by Wiseman, "Whoever receives a loan, but afterwards returns it, can deny that he ever received the loan, understanding to himself, 'received it, so that I should pay it.'" Again, "he who comes from a place falsely supposed to be infectious can deny that he came from that place, by understanding 'as a pestilent place,' because that is in the mind of the inquirer." Again, "if anybody be asked to dine, and the food he eats is unpalatable, and he is asked if he likes it, he can answer, though he dislikes it, 'I like it,' understanding to himself, 'because it is good for mortification.'" Again, Liguori taught that, let oaths be ever so valid, they could be relaxed by the Church. The Pontifex himself could render null and void all oaths whatever, and could decree that the Sabbath should only last a few hours. As regarded the form of worship, Cardinal Wiseman is said to have told them that it was easier to get to heaven by the Virgin Mary than through Christ (?); but we, as Protestants, needed not the Virgin or any of the saints of heaven to assist us, and if they were to proffer their services we might answer emphatically that we could do without them! After some further reference to St. Alphonsus Liguori's works, and to the Psalter of St. Bonaventure, also approved by Cardinal Wiseman, the rev. gentleman observed that he had now told them what Dr. Wiseman held, what he was bound to teach, and what he was not ashamed to avow and proclaim in his writings as the teaching of truth. He trusted that that would lead them not to detest the man, but to shrink with horror from the principles he avowed. His own strong conviction was, that, infallible as he was, the Pope had made a gross blunder by his recent appointments. (Cheers.) Pius IX. had felt the pulse of the Protestants of England—because it was calm he thought it weak, because it was quiet he thought it indifferent. He imagined it so cold that Old England would bear a "Cardinal." He would find in a few weeks that England could not even bear a monk! and if he might judge from the manly spirit exhibited in the Prime Minister's letter, she would not bear a Puseyite even very long! (Cheering and laughter.) He solemnly believed that this appearance of the Cardinal in our capital had been like the appearance of the French otilla off Boulogne—one had raised the loyalty of England (?), the other had excited its Protestantism to the

boiling-point! He believed, too, that another result of the Cardinal's presence would be that Puseyism would disappear! They would have the real thing, and a sham one would not do. If the comparative merits of the two Churches were to be tested by the splendour of the ritual, by the gorgeoussness of the robes, by the grandeur of the service, then he must express his deliberate conviction that St. Barnabas-in-the-West would be swallowed up amid the splendours of St. George's-in-the-Fields. (Great cheering.) If we were to have Popery at all, let us have Italian Popery under an Italian flag, and not under the flag of Old England. (Cheers.) This importation, he solemnly believed, would do much to unite all Protestants. He told the Churchmen in that room that they could not afford to do without the dissenters, and he told the dissenters that they could not afford to do without the Church. (Cheers.) They might depend upon it that a crisis was coming that would demand the combined faithfulness and efforts of all. He believed that all the sects of the Protestant Church differed only in ceremonial details! and that they agreed in all that was vital, permanent, and precious! He believed that all our Churches were but trees planted of the Lord—each grew best in its native soil, but all their branches waved in the unsectarian air! all their fruits ripened in the same catholic soil, and the roots blended with each other in the ground beneath, invisible to us, and all cohered with the roots of the tree of life that was in the midst of the Paradise of our God. (Prolonged cheering.) Let them, then, be brethren in arms—rivals only in renown. Let them accept the definition of the Bishop of London—that the Pope was not the centre of unity, but the Lord Jesus Christ; and let them remember that uniformity was not God's law, but that unity was; uniformity a tailor could produce by cutting all their coats alike, but unity God alone could produce by changing all their hearts. If he were of Dr. Wiseman's school, he might go into a forest in the autumn, and, shaping each tree into a cone, might exclaim, "See what uniformity I have produced!" But going back in "leafy June" to behold once again his sylvan uniformity, he should find that every tree had shot forth branches at its own sweet will, and that the only trees which were just as he had left them were the dead ones. (Cheers.) It was just so with the Church. Wherever there was life, there would be unity, but no uniformity!—wherever there was death, there would be perfect uniformity, but no unity! (Cheers.) Let them, then, melt their common disputes, and, preferring each his own ecclesiastical communion, let all co-operate against Rome! and in upholding Protestant and vital Christianity! (Cheers.) He protested, as a loyal subject, against this chartered presumption of the Pope—against this apportionment of England as if it were a colony of Rome—against this assumption of the prerogative that belonged to our Queen—and he said that it became every Protestant to shout "Down with the tiara in England, and up with Old England's Crown." (Loud cheers.) If there were a Church under heaven—and he said it, having nothing to fear or to expect from it—that was celebrated by the most splendid scholarship or possessing more faithful ministers than another, it was the Protestant Church of this country; and the ignoring of such a Church was the ignoring of them all, so that the indignation which they felt should exceed their fear. (Cheers.) His weightiest protest, however, was not that Rome ignored them, but that she ignored the Church of Christ!—not that she dishonoured our most gracious Queen, but that she dishonoured the Lord Jesus Christ! His charge was that she inculcated doctrines that must defile the purity of our firesides, and must disturb the whole texture of social life; and he hoped that the insolent attempt would kindle throughout England a feeling of enthusiastic antipathy to the principles and practices of Rome. (Cheers.) If the worst should come, let there be reproach to our names, confiscation to our goods, martyrdom to our ministers! but let there be loyalty to our Queen, and faithfulness to our God. In the words of the great writer who so thoroughly reflected English feeling in his great conceptions,—

'Thou can'st not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous,
To charge me to an answer as the Pope.
Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England
Add this much more: that no Italian priest
Shall tythe or toll in our dominions.'

A vote of thanks was then passed to the Rev. Dr. Cumming.

The *Third Series* contains the Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture on the inquiry whether "The Queen of England or the Pope of Rome is the Head of the English Church?" Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; concluded by an extraordinary article, entitled "The Vatican Masquerade." *Complete in one Pamphlet, price only One Penny.*

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE REV. T. NOLAN'S LECTURE ;
LETTER FROM B. HAWES, ESQ., M.P. ;
THE PASTORAL OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOP OF
NORTHAMPTON ;
LETTER FROM DR. CUMMING ;
LETTERS FROM THE BISHOP OF ASAPH & VISCOUNT
FEILDING ; AND
THE "VATICAN MASQUERADE."

THE REV. T. NOLAN'S LECTURE.

"IS THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE SUPERIOR TO THAT OF THE QUEEN?"

The Rev. Dr. Cumming having invoked the blessing of Heaven on the present proceedings,

Mr. HENRY POWNALL (the Chairman) said it was a subject for great thankfulness that the impertinent intrusion of the Pope of Rome into the concerns of this Kingdom, interfering as he did with the lawful prerogative of the Sovereign and the constitutional liberties of the subject, had raised such an unanimous spirit of indignation throughout the land ; and as Protestants desirous of maintaining their freedom and rights, they might rise to propose a vote of thanks to the Pope. (Cheers and laughter.) As English subjects they justly valued every prerogative that appertained to the Crown as links in the chain which bound the liberty and constitutional welfare of this country together. As soon would free-born Englishmen submit to the foreign potentate who might come to dictate war or peace, as to the dictation of one who, with the map of their country spread on the table before him, presumed to parcel the country out into spiritual jurisdictions at his own will, delegating authority to individuals to be named only by himself. (Hear, hear.) The only thing he regretted was this, that this new aggression of Papal authority was not made in the old-fashioned way—that the Pope had not sent twelve Italian priests to fill his newly-erected sees, and then they might perchance have learned more truly than they now did what was to be the future destiny of our country. Not only did this foreign potentate presume to parcel out England at his discretion, but he had ignored all the principles on which our rights had stood for twelve hundred years. But England would not submit to such dictation ; they would renew and reiterate that noble protestation which our ancestors made three hundred years ago. (Cheers.) He would not long detain them from the important facts which his reverend friend, Mr. Nolan, had to submit. They had had meetings for the expression of their opinion in their several parishes, and he hoped, too, they would have such meetings in the counties ; he only wished to observe, that this great meeting had been convened for the purpose of more strongly impressing on public attention the true character of that spiritual tyranny which was now sought to be imposed on this country. Sentiments had lately been put forth, in reference to this subject, which demanded a word of comment. (Hear, hear.) Their attention had, last week, been directed to the remarkable letter from the Premier of this country ; and every one who had read it must have felt that it was worthy of a seion of the distinguished house of Russell. (Cheers.) It was to be regretted that another letter, from one eminently distinguished in the political world, had since come forth, in which, addressing the Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Bucks, the writer (Mr. D'Israeli) uttered these sentiments :—"The fact is, that the whole question has been surrendered, and decided in favour of the Pope, by the present Government ; and the Ministers who recognised the pseudo-Archbishop of Tuam as a peer and a prelate cannot object to the appointment of a pseudo-Archbishop of Westminster, even though he be a Cardinal." (Disapprobation.) What had been surrendered? The right of the Pope to parcel out this land

Third Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.] [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row
Of whom may be had "*The Roman Catholic Question,*" First and Second Series,
price 1d. each.

into as many dioceses as he pleased? Was that the surrender? (Hear, hear.) That was part and parcel of the prerogative of the Sovereign supreme in all temporal and ecclesiastical matters; and it was obviously a mistake to say that anything in that respect had ever been surrendered to the Pope. (Hear, hear.) Whether there had been perhaps a little more civility than was absolutely necessary was another question—(a laugh)—and when they found how that civility had been abused, it behoved them, perhaps, to be a little more guarded in their language for the future. (Hear.) It was not because the term “bishop” had been used in reference to Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, in certain commissions, that it was to be said that the English Government had surrendered all ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Pope of Rome. (Cheers.) As well might it be assumed and said, that because in the commission appointing a man to the magistracy he was styled esquire, all his family were to call themselves esquires to the remotest posterity. Nothing has been lost, nothing would be lost, if they were only true to themselves. It was said that the Pope had made a great mistake; do not believe that. It was only an attempt on the part of the Pope to get the wedge in, in order that greater inroads on our liberties might be made. (Cheers.) It would only be a mistake if the Protestants of England suffered it to be so; if, through the supineness of the people, the Pope was allowed to encroach on the lawful prerogative of the Sovereign of this kingdom. If they suffered this, then they would find that the Pope had not made a great mistake. Let them hope, however, trusting in the manifestations which had been made of the determined zeal to preserve our dearly-purchased rights and liberties, that the future historian of England, in recounting the annals of Queen Victoria, would never have to drop his pen in sorrow, exclaiming, “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth? Why stood ye not fast in the liberty with which Christ hath made us free?”

The Rev. Mr. NOLAN, who was greeted with much applause, said—Mr. Chairman and Christian friends, the object and occasion of this lecture was sufficiently explained when you last met in this place, by my learned and eloquent friend Dr. Cumming. I desire, under the blessing of God, to direct myself to the special object of bringing under your consideration some facts of vital importance connected with the present crisis. Eager as I am to address myself to the subject of the present lecture—the supremacy, whether the authority of the Pope is superior to that of the beloved Sovereign of England—I wish to make one or two preliminary remarks, so far as to mention one or two large principles which it is my earnest desire to keep before me for my guidance. At the same time, I wish to disclaim one or two grave imputations which our enemies sought to fasten on us when we engaged in this warfare. The first principle, and it was not a vain thing we have contended for, is the free circulation of the blessed Word of God. (Cheers.) It was to this great end that the main efforts of the Reformers tended. The Church of Rome has, with invariable fidelity, adhered to the contrary principle. This has been the unvarying tenor of the encyclical letters of the Popes. Leo the Twelfth, Gregory the Sixteenth, and Pope Pius the Ninth have, like their predecessors, all acted on the policy of keeping the people in darkness. In the first encyclical letter of the present Pontiff, he insisted that the Word of God should be effectually kept from the people. No two systems can possibly be more antagonistic; and at the very outset of the question we come to this—either the Word of God must put down the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, or the tenets of Rome must put out the light of God’s truth. This first tenet, the free circulation of the Holy Scriptures, is a vital first principle for which we contend. (Cheers.) There are other principles of great importance; but all dwindle into insignificance compared with that which is embodied in the phrase, the free circulation of the Bible. This is the first great principle which I would enforce on your attention, and the next is closely allied to it. As free-born Englishmen interested in the preservation of the privileges and freedom so long the glorious characteristic of our beloved country, think on this; let the light be put out, let this infringement on your rights by Rome succeed, and where is the man who can promise to his children the continuance, for half a century longer, of those blessings which England has enjoyed, and which have elevated her to so high a place in the annals of civilised glory? (Cheers.) These are the great principles involved, and placed in peril, in the question now under consideration. In passing, I would also advert to another matter. When I speak of Cardinal Wiseman, God forbid that we should seem to entertain any feeling of personal hostility towards him. For myself, I disclaim any such feeling as sincerely and truly as my learned friend, Dr. Cumming, did on the last occasion of our meeting here. As a private individual, he is free to entertain his own opinion; he is free to come and go, as one entitled to live under our free Protestant Constitution, and belonging to a land which has proclaimed liberty of conscience. But when I speak of him as the Cardinal Archbishop, I speak of a temporal prince accredited from a hostile potentate, whose policy and aim is directly antagonistic to the maintenance of those rights and privileges on which our freedom depends. (Hear, hear.) We ask you to protest against this claim of a foreign usurper, to declare in language such that Cardinal Wiseman may report to his master, “England has spoken—This man shall not reign over us; the surface of England shall not be parcelled out at his will; nor shall

the subjects of Queen Victoria be handed over to the jurisdiction of the Pope." (Loud cheers.) Let us renew the protest made three centuries ago, that the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in this realm of England. (Continued cheering.) Let it not be supposed, that the boasted civilisation of the nineteenth century, or that the gentler tone of the age, has in any degree mitigated the severity of the principles which have ever swayed the Court of Rome. In seeking dominion over us, the intolerance manifested by the Vatican breathes more of Constance and Lateran than of the mild spirit of Him who was meek and lowly of heart. We disdain any personal object or party view in promoting this movement. It has been alleged that it is inconsistent on our part to oppose the principles of our opponents and at the same time to profess love for them as individuals. What is love of God, but hatred and the most unsparing hostility to sin, with unbounded love to the unhappy victims of sin?—So much, then, for the principles which I avow and the imputations I disclaim; I come now to the subject which more immediately demands our attention. And I take this opportunity of adverting to the circumstances under which the present lecture originated. I was present at a meeting of the committee of the British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, when the subject of these lectures was discussed. It was at the time when the Synod of Thurles had come to an adverse vote on the subject of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland; and I suggested whether this and other practices of Romanism in that country might not be with advantage brought under the consideration of an English public. (Hear, hear.) It was decided that the subject was worthy of discussion, and I now venture to direct your attention to it. My friends, the question of Ireland may be one of which you have heard much; but at the present juncture it is most important that you should lend your most serious attention to facts which have received too little regard, and which have the most important bearing on the all-important question which now happily has created so much lively interest in this country. Ireland, to use the language of mathematics, is a diagram on which a great principle was to be proved; it was the same principle which is now about to be introduced here. Ireland is the plate on which the problem has been worked out in all its variations. It is our duty to gather experience from the misfortunes of others. The liberties of England, her laws, her government, her free institutions, her very existence as a nation, now tremble in the balance. It is now to be decided whether as a country she is to continue to enjoy the Word of God, or be condemned to worship in the dens and caves of the earth. (Cheers.) I would now point to these principles, and to the practical working of them in Ireland, and leave it to you to say whether the lawful and constitutional supremacy of our beloved Sovereign is consistent with the existence of this *imperium in imperio*. I come now to the consideration of the first point—to the doctrine known as the divine right of kings. I hold in my hands a work from the pen of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, one of the ablest advocates of Romanism the present generation has seen. He has now passed away—I believe, beyond question, rejoicing in the faith of Jesus. The letters from which I am about to quote are known by the signature "J. K. L." Writing to Mr. Robertson, a Member of Parliament, he says: "The ministry of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood; they have been ill treated, and they may yield for a moment to the influence of nature. This clergy, with few exceptions, are from the poorer ranks of the people; they inherit their feelings; they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic governments, and they have imbibed the doctrines of Locke and Paley more deeply than those of Bellarmine or even of Bossuet on the divine right of kings; they know much more of the principles of the Constitution than they do of passive obedience. If a rebellion were rung from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of excommunication would ever be fulminated by the Catholic prelates; or, if fulminated, "it would fall," as Grattan once said of British supremacy, "like a spent thunderbolt." (Hear, hear.) The reason of the allusion to the doctrine of the divine right of kings will be manifest from the following facts. The college of Maynooth was started in 1795. The founders were upholders of the doctrine of the divine right of kings. That doctrine was maintained as long as a pretender to the throne of England was alive. But when Cardinal York, the last member of the exiled family, died in 1807 (his brother, it may be remembered, died in 1788, and his father in 1765), the principles of Bellarmine and Bossuet were given up, and those of Locke and Paley substituted. This fact, in a remarkable degree, illustrates the power inherent in the Roman Catholic Church of adapting its principles to the circumstances of time and country. (Hear, hear.) I next come to the important question of the power which the Romish Church assumes over heretical sovereigns. In a famous work, the "*Secunda Secundæ*" of Thomas Aquinas, this is proposed in the twelfth question—"Whether a prince, on account of his apostasy from the faith, loses his dominion over his subjects, so that they are not bound to obey him?" In answering the question, the writer quotes from Gregory the Seventh—"We, observing the laws of our holy predecessor, absolve, by Apostolic authority, from their engagements (*sacramento*) those who are bound to persons excommunicated, in fealty, or by obligation of an oath, and strictly prohibit them to render any allegiance until the excommunicated make satisfaction; but apostates from the faith, as also heretics, he execrated."

And, therefore, as Aquinas concludes, "As soon as any one is denounced by a sentence, as excommunicated for apostacy, his subjects are, *ipso facto*, released from his dominion, and from the oath of allegiance by which they were bound to him." Such was the authority of the Romish Church, according to Thomas Aquinas. But why, it may be asked, do I now refer to so ancient an authority as Aquinas? For these reasons:—At the time the College of Maynooth was established, the opinions of St. Augustine, as introduced by Aquinas, were recommended as authoritative by the Propaganda. That was in 1795. And I find in the official report relative to the conduct of the College this strong confirmation of the fact, The Rev. Charles MacNelly, Professor of Logic, Ethics, and Metaphysics, being asked a question as to the books from which he taught, replied, "The authorities, or works, to which I have occasionally referred are the following:—St. Thomas Aquinas's, of whose "Secunda Secunda" I have often spoken in terms of the highest commendation, as being, in my opinion, one of the best treatises on ethics." Now, let us see what is the position of England in reference to this matter. You endow the clergy for teaching principles which, when inquired into, you are bound by the fealty you owe to your Sovereign to punish as treasons; for if these principles are carried into practice assuredly it is treason. In endowing that institution, you have made no provision for ascertaining what were the doctrines which were to be taught there; you have only cared for the increase of the number to be taught there. (Hear, hear.) These are facts derived from official evidence. The next point for consideration was this—What are the powers really claimed by the Church of Rome over Protestant countries? So much has been said on this point, on many occasions, that I need hardly say more than name the Bull *In Cœna Domini*, and the canons of the third council of the Lateran. It is enough to say that the bull excommunicates all Protestant powers. Discussion has arisen as to the effect of this bull; Dr. Doyle disclaims it, but it is notorious that it is still in force. By the third canon of Lateran, the Bishop—and, if the Bishop, it is to be presumed an Archbishop too—is bound, even in places where the office of the Holy Inquisition is in force, to take care to purge the diocese of all heretics. I pass these facts without further proof; the necessity of adding any proof is obviated by the fact that these acts of Papal authority are only suspended; they have never been rescinded. The attempt has never been made to deny that these bulls and canons still retain their original authority. (Hear, hear.) Another principle of the Romish Church into which we have now shortly to inquire is this—Over whom is this power exercised? On this point I cite the authority of Peter Dens. I quote from the second volume of his work, which is written in Latin, but I give a faithful interpretation of what he says on the subject. In answer to the question proposed, whether baptised infidels can be compelled, by corporal punishment, to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the Church, he replies affirmatively, for the reason that they have been baptised. This is a point of great importance, and most worthy of attentive consideration; for it is thus manifest that the Romish Church claims jurisdiction, even to the extent of corporal punishment, over all who have been baptised. (Hear, hear.) Having glanced at these various general points, I would now pass over to Ireland, and intreat your attention to some facts illustrative of the practical working of these principles. In 1829, Catholic Emancipation was granted. Large promises were made, and the most sanguine hopes were entertained of the healing effects of that measure. In no one case was its provisions not carried out to the fullest extent, so as to leave Romanists at perfect freedom. Had they one cause of complaint? I dare not ask the same question on the other side. The provisions were all carefully attended to, and where penalties existed they were disregarded. We take not into account what apostacy there has been in the bosom of our own Church. Standing up here as a clergyman of the Church of England, it becomes me, in the first place, to protest against any sympathy with those who within her sanctuary have not scrupled to betray her to the enemy—against the unfair course of policy (I care nothing for party) which has been pursued by the Government of this country in reference to religion in Ireland. (Hear, hear.) I allude particularly to the policy of the Government in reference to national education in that country, and to the colleges more recently established under the authority of Parliament. It is deeply to be regretted that the ingenuous mind of Lord Stanley was too soon caught by the plausibilities of those with whom he had to do. He used to the Duke of Leinster the objection, that the bill originally introduced was contrary to the principles of the Church of Rome. Here it should be remarked, the objection came not from the Duke of Leinster, but from Lord Stanley. The National Board was established, and, alas for my country! education only became national by ceasing to become scriptural. (Hear, hear.) In the next place, we have the endowment of Maynooth, and not one spark of gratitude to England for doing so. (Hear, hear.) And what have you done for your own Church—for the branch of your own Church in that country? Turn to your Prayer Books, and you will find it described as the United Church of England and Ireland. They were placed in the same boat, and launched together in the same sea. Beware that you suffer not your own Church to come within the peril of the same influence. I do not presume to say that she contains a monopoly of authority, but I do say, that should that great ship be suffered to go down, many of the smaller craft in England, that lie safe

under her lee, if that shelter were removed, I would not give much for their continuance, nor would their existence be worth many years' purchase. (Cheers.) You have sacrificed ten sees; you have confiscated one-fourth of the property; you have exalted the power of one Church by diminishing the power of the other. But the Lord is great; I sincerely believe that the Church was never in a more healthy and wholesome condition than she is now. (Hear, hear.) It is true that we see some of the clergy of England led by the wily ones to the bosom of Rome; but let us cross to Ireland, and we see the poor and the despised not only abandoning the errors of Popery, but becoming converts in spirit and truth of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Cheers.) I approach the consideration of facts belonging to a more recent period. I come to the memorable year of 1848, the year which was to be marked by a rising from one corner of the land to the other. The priests of the Romish Church only waited the course of events. By whom was this rebellion projected? By the very priests you have been educating at Maynooth; who wished to carry out the principles of the third Lateran and the *Cana Domini*. The priests urged on the rebellion to the last point, and only retired when they found that there was danger to themselves. At a later period our gracious Queen visits Ireland, and is received with the liveliest feelings of loyalty and affection. Addresses poured from all corners with the utmost unanimity of feeling, save from one quarter: the newspapers affirmed, and the statement has not been contradicted, that when the Romish prelates met to consider an address to her Majesty, it was only carried by a majority of one. (Hear, hear.) That is a fact in strict consistency with their principles. I come now to another part of the subject, and a most remarkable one, I mean the Synod of Thurles. That was the last assembly of the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church. The great object of deliberation on that occasion was the Queen's Colleges. The first things regarded by Lord Stanley were the principles of the Church of Rome. We take our stand on the scriptural foundation, and declare that we shall not be parties to any system which keeps the Scriptures from the heart and eye of the child. (Hear, hear.) Look to the treatment of the minor by the law. By that noble law of England it is declared that the child shall not be left without protection; and the first law-officer of the Crown is made the guardian of the child. We ask the same care for the spiritual birthright of the child; we ask the Word of God as his most precious inheritance and blessing. On this principle we stood out, but Government thought differently, and, with the best intentions, destroyed this National Board. Into this question I cannot now further enter; I merely cite facts to show the disposition which was evinced to yield everything to the Romish Church at that day. But that Church is always grasping, and though it has had everything its own way, the Queen's Colleges are now denounced as godless, because Rome does not possess everything, because Protestant surgeons are permitted to give demonstrations in anatomy, and Protestant lawyers to read lectures on law—because everything was not placed in the grasp of Rome herself. At that meeting a subscription was begun for the purpose of establishing a Roman Catholic University. They were not satisfied with the liberality which has been exhibited towards them at Trinity College. A Roman Catholic may freely enter there; he is exempted from the religious requirements of the University. The Roman Catholics have no right to complain; they are excluded from nothing but the fellowships and scholarships. Then, with regard to Maynooth, it was never intended that that institution should be supported by public grant, but by donations. From 1845 down to the present time no donations have been made to it. It was established as a hotbed of Jacobinism, and, so long as the war continued, money flowed in; but from the time of peace, when victory was supreme, crushing the hopes of Romanism in Ireland, Maynooth was left by Romanism to sink or swim. The Synod of Thurles complain that the new colleges are godless, and therefore they have denounced them. You taxed yourselves to support them. You gave to Ireland, as you continue to give, with a generous hand; but a Sovereign Pontiff, seated at Rome, is actually called on to decide whether the will of your Parliament and Sovereign is to take effect. (Hear, hear.) I forgot, at an earlier period of my address, to refer to the permission which Peter Dens gives in his second volume on the subject of reading the Scriptures. The reading of the Scriptures is expressly forbidden, except for the purpose of deceiving unwary Protestants with the belief that the tenets of the Church do not forbid the free circulation of the Bible; but permission must be exclusively given by the Church before any one can have the free use of the Scriptures. To return to the decision of the Synod of Thurles, if the doctrines of the Church which have been adverted to were better understood, we should feel less difficulty than has hitherto been popularly experienced in understanding this question. Ere we pass from Thurles let me offer a remark or two in reference to an important person who has lately appeared in Ireland, I mean Dr. Cullen, the Pope's legate in that country. It is worthy of particular note that so long as the exiled family of the Stuarts lived they pretended to the appointment of the Irish bishops. After the extinction of that family, inquiry was made at Rome on the point, and the answer was, that the Pope possessed the right, but he never insisted on it. Several names were usually sent to Rome, and the Pope laid his hand on the first name in the list. But now, for the first time, the Pope has sent one to be Primate of Ireland who, though

of Irish extraction, has lived thirty years in Rome. This is another striking fact illustrative of the change of policy on the part of the Roman Sec. Another fact is most worthy of notice. When Dr. Cullen came to Ireland he was invited to become a member of the Charity Commission. He has refused to do so, and the reason assigned is this, that he was not disposed to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen. I state this fact on the authority of the newspaper, and the statement is uncontradicted. He has taken the oath to the Pope, and I am just reminded of the fact that our friend Dr. Cumming will resume this portion of his subject here next Thursday. (Cheers.) Dr. Cullen has taken the oath to the Pope twice; but the oath to Victoria he has declined to take, and, so far as we believe, his reason was a reluctance to take that oath! (Hear, hear.) In the course of my observations, I have taken occasion to remark that we are in some respect ourselves guilty; but, by the blessing of God, the lesson we have received will not be thrown away. If the Reformation was worth the cost at which it was obtained, it was worth keeping. If the principles of the Reformation are wrong, then was it wrong in those who effected the Reformation to imperil the peace of the country three centuries ago. It is a characteristic of mankind to undervalue that of which they have held long possession. "Then the chief captain came and said unto Paul, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yes. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was born free." With a great sum our ancestors purchased that blessed freedom which we now enjoy; but we have not been regardful of it, nor of the duty which has devolved on us to hand down that possession to our posterity. While I lament for the past condition of the Church of England, I fully believe that it is true at the core, and that there will be a prompt and ready resistance on the part of the majority of the clergy against this daring invasion of our rights and liberties by Pius the Ninth. But the main reliance has been on the laity of the Church. The undisguised efforts of Tractarians have been well touched on by our noble Premier. "There is a danger which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign. Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice. The honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption. What is the danger to be apprehended from a foreign prince of no great power compared to the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself? (Cheers.) I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their insidious course; but I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of a nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul." (Loud cheers.) These words cannot be too often repeated, nor the warning pondered, by the Church. I have in my hand a pamphlet entitled "A Statement of Circumstances connected with the Proposal of Resolutions at a Special General Meeting of the Bristol Church Union, Oct. 1, 1850. By William Palmer, M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury." In that pamphlet the author says: "No one admitted the claims or doctrine of the Church of Rome, but the general feeling was opposed to any censure of them." With such opinions openly expressed by the clergy, is it to be wondered that the Church of Rome, ever on the watch to extend her power, should embrace the present opportunity; and that such demands as these should, in a recent number of the Catholic publication called "The Lamp," be put forth:—"A Bill for diplomatic relations with Rome, and on Rome's terms, must be passed by the British legislature. Britain must yield as the younger state. His Legate must be received at St. James's; and that Legate must be a Cardinal. Verily too (and it is our impression), the Cardinal's hat will be quite as attractive, and as comely an object in a court cavalcade, as the jewelled turban of an Infidel, or even the variegated cap of a Persian ambassador. . . . There is an admitted sanctity about her anointed servants that chills the audacity of the loudest brawler; and where is the vituperator among them who would not shrink into his original nothingness beneath the glance of his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster." (Loud laughter.) Of all the dangers by which freedom can be threatened, the most perilous by far is the power of the Church of Rome; not so much from its inherent strength as the insidious power of adapting itself to circumstances, and of concentrating all its energies on a given point. The Pope, like Iago, might say:

"— whether he kill Cassio,
Or Cassio him, or each do kill the other,
Every way makes my gain."

(Laughter.) The rev. gentleman concluded his lecture by an earnest appeal to his audience to use their best exertions to preserve the glorious privileges which had been committed to their trust, and to use their utmost efforts to transmit them to posterity.

DR. CUMMING AND CARDINAL WISEMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—I think you have in some degree misapprehended the drift of my remarks, at the Hanover-square Rooms, on the recent Papal aggression. After some remarks on Exeter-hall, you say, "Such seems to be the Rev. Dr. Cumming, who says that if the faith of the Pope be the true one, it is great kindness in him to propagate it amongst us, and that, therefore, the question to be considered is—Is the faith of the Pope true or false?" On re-perusing the very faithful report of my statement in your columns, I do not discover that I thus narrowed the question. What I did say, as reported in the *Times*, was, "He confessed, if Protestantism were, what the Pope designated it—a deadly heresy, and if Popery were, what Cardinal Wiseman contended it was—a great truth, the Pope had done an act of great kindness in sending a cardinal missionary to instruct us. But if the case were the very reverse, he could not sympathise with that compact which said to the Pope, 'You keep your bishops in Austria, Italy, and Spain, and we will keep ours in England, Ireland, and the realms of her Majesty.'" Surely, if our Protestant Christianity be heresy, it is kindness in anybody to do for us what we try to do for others in similar circumstances—namely, teach us a more excellent way. But this, I imagine, was not the whole question. I stated that our controversy, however, must not be that of person against person—it was not that of Church against Church; but it was a controversy of light against darkness, of freedom against slavery, of the rights and privileges of our country against the attacks and assaults of Rome. I also added, that the Cardinal, as a consistent Romanist, swore to attack and persecute us; that he inculcated principles that must "defile the purity of our firesides and disturb the whole texture of social life." In fact, it was my professed effort to prove that, as the Pope of Rome had superseded the Protestant Church in Westminster, and thereby claimed all its inhabitants as his subjects, it was important, though not exclusively so, to consider, not if his dogmas were true or false, but how far the effects of the new teaching would be a benefit to the people. While the truth or falsity of the Pope's religion is with the millions a very vital question, I said I regarded its practical results in social life as a main reason why, as Britons, we should protest against its recent intrusion. As a Cardinal, Bishop Wiseman is a foreign prince, and so far an intruder and an usurper of the jurisdiction of our gracious Queen. On this there is but one feeling of indignation—but one determination of resistance. As an Archbishop, his second aspect, he is a teacher of doctrines of social disorganisation; and on this ground I argued he should be met also. It is his religious professions that sustain his political pretensions. I hope to give a lecture soon, in the same place, on a part of the Cardinal's recent oath, which will prove that a Romish Cardinal cannot be a loyal Englishman.

In the meantime, is it not matter of satisfaction to you that every loyal and every religious man, each on the ground he thinks weightiest, is opposing with increasing earnestness this politico-ecclesiastical crusade of Pio Nono? You have taken up and argued with transcendent power one definite view of this question. I am sure you will not refuse, or treat with indifference, the earnest antagonism of those who, rightly or wrongly, think there are other grounds which to them appear weightiest and worthiest of prominence.

We have a great object before us, and a good cause behind us; and I am sure you must be too glad to see the deepening and burning sense of indignation and resistance which animates a whole population to be sorry that all the elements of it are not identical.

If our opposition be faithful, truthful, and charitable, it may not be a narrowing the controversy, but rather an enlarging of its basis, so that the greatest number of the most decided opponents may be brought to the field.

The division of labour is valuable in war as in commerce. Let each on his own ground, but all, on one ground as another, resist *in limine* what may prove irresistible if despised or connived at.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

November 11.

JOHN CUMMING.

P.S.—Suffer me to add one remark more. Whether we like it or not, the Cardinal's teaching will be forced on our consideration. The Pope neither will nor can recall his bull. Westminster, with all its inhabitants, by a solemn Papal deed, as irrevocably as the Papacy itself, are committed—all the inhabitants of Westminster, our most gracious Queen included—as subjects of Cardinal Wiseman. We may expel the Cardinal, if so decided; but we cannot make the Pope do what would be Papal suicide—recall his deed.

As Vicar Apostolic, Dr. Wiseman had not a single Englishman for his subject. As Archbishop of Westminster, he has committed to him as a subject—for this is the word, and not more than the thing—every inhabitant of Westminster. He will compel reluctant subjects "*pro posse*."

The whole conflict lies in the religion, not in the temporal sovereignty, of the Pope. If Pio Nono be a mere temporal prince, his partitionment of England as a matter of map-

making, or insolent impertinence, which a few words from Lord John Russell will finish up. But it is as the pretended Chief Bishop of Christendom that he has acted, and no diplomatic explanation will make him retract.

An exposure of his whole superstition will yet be the substance of many leaders in the *Times*.

Like two men-of-war, the two Churches are side by side—lashed to each other, and one or other must go down. I have no doubt which it will be.

B. HAWES, ESQ., M.P., AND CARDINAL WISEMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,—In your paper of to-day you insert a letter, signed “A. B. C.,” in which the following passage occurs:—

“Can Lord John Russell be sincere in his new-born zeal against the ‘mummeries of superstition,’ when he allows one of his subordinates, Mr. Benjamin Hawes, M.P., to attend a ‘superstitious’ meeting of ‘Catholics of the London district,’ at the ‘Thatched House Tavern,’ for the purpose of supporting the following resolution, as advertised in the public papers of the 17th August last:—‘That it is the duty of Catholics, agreeably to the practice of Catholic countries in like cases, to meet the expenditure attendant on the promotion of the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman to the rank of a prince of the Church?’”

And the writer concludes:—

“Let me ask his lordship if it is true that his Under Secretary for the Colonies, besides publicly speaking at the above-mentioned meeting in support of the resolution I have quoted, has actually subscribed 10*l.* towards procuring one of those said ‘mummeries,’ a cardinal’s hat, for Dr. Wiseman?”

I am not sorry that your correspondent gives me the opportunity of stating publicly my reasons for attending a meeting of the “Catholics of the London District,” and for taking any part whatever in its proceedings, and stating also what I did say upon that occasion.

I have long enjoyed the friendship of Cardinal Wiseman, and I hope long to enjoy it. Upon his being created a cardinal, and leaving England, under the expectation of residing abroad for many years (which to my knowledge was Dr. Wiseman’s expectation), a common friend of his and mine called upon me, and informed that Dr. Wiseman’s friends intended to offer him some mark of their regard and respect. My reply was, that upon every personal consideration I should be happy to join, if my doing so as a Protestant, and upon private and personal grounds only, would be acceptable to Roman Catholics.

I was subsequently invited to the meeting, and I attended it. But finding that the address to Dr. Wiseman was such as I could not, as a Protestant, sign, and that the resolutions were also such as none but Roman Catholics could support, I was obliged to state the grounds alone upon which I attended the meeting, and to say, that if I could be permitted to show the respect I entertained, as a Protestant, for Dr. Wiseman, as a most excellent, charitable, and learned prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, I was ready to do so; but that it was impossible for me to concur in the address, or the resolutions, for very obvious reasons.

The meeting unanimately acquiesced in my view, and I contributed my mite of respect to even the prelate of a rival Church, whose worth and excellence I knew and admired, and whose friendship I think it an honour to possess.

I, however, joined in no address, nor did I second or support any resolution; nor was I aware till very recently that it had been publicly asserted that I had done so.

For the part I took on that occasion, and for the motives which actuated me, I shall not even condescend to a vindication; nor shall I, from any fear of being misunderstood, abate my admiration of good men, nor my desire to share in the promotion of good works, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. Charity is still, I hope, a virtue prized by both.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

B. HAWES.

9, Queen’s-square, Westminster, Nov. 12.

* * * We inserted our correspondent’s letter after verifying his statement by referring to our own advertising columns, and also to those of some of our contemporaries, of the day in question—the 17th of August last. We there found it stated that the resolution quoted by “A. B. C.” “was moved by H. R. Bagnshaw, Esq., and seconded by Thomas Jackson, Esq., and supported by Benjamin Hawes, Esq., M.P., and carried unanimously.” It was not, however, our intention to blame Mr. Hawes for the step he had taken, but, on the contrary, to contrast his liberality and tolerance with the illiberality and intolerance displayed by Lord John Russell; for, surely, if Lord John was justified in denouncing the religious worship of any members either of his own or of the Roman Catholic Church as the “mummeries of superstition,” it was not an unreasonable inquiry how he could allow

one of his subordinates to attend a "superstitious" meeting, for the "superstitious" purpose of procuring a "mummery" (to wit, a cardinal's hat) for the gentleman who has now become "Archbishop of Westminster," and who has thereby afforded his lordship an opportunity either of manifesting his persecuting spirit, or of making political capital for the next session.

THE CATHOLIC BISHOP OF NORTHAMPTON.

TO OUR BELOVED FLOCK, THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE
DIOCESE OF NORTHAMPTON.

HEALTH AND BENEDICTION IN THE LORD.

"Why have the Gentiles raged, and the people devised vain things? The kings of the earth have stood up, and the princes have met together against the Lord, and against his anointed."—*Psalms* ii.

DEARLY BELOVED,—Till the arrival of our brief from Rome we had proposed to defer our formal announcement of the late hierarchical arrangements of the Holy See, by which the new diocese of Northampton has been created, consisting of the same counties as formerly composed the Eastern District, with the exception of the counties of Lincoln and Rutland, which now form part of the diocese of Nottingham.

But circumstances have arisen which make it necessary to lose no time in addressing to you a few plain words, to vindicate the conduct of our Holy Father in the establishment of a new hierarchy for England, and to justify the obedience and gratitude with which we accept the spiritual favour.

It is not for us to judge harshly of the motives which influence the conduct of a certain portion of our fellow-countrymen at the present juncture; but at the same time we hesitate not to say, that the present outbreak of indignant feeling, the violent declamation, the turpious onslaught, and unscrupulous misrepresentation of the public press, against the Sovereign Pontiff and ourselves—the new English Bishops, exhibit a something little short of insanity.

What, then, dearly beloved, is the crime against the Crown and Majesty of England of which we have been guilty? The Bishop of Rome, the lawful successor of St. Peter, inheriting from that holy Apostle the same divine commission which was given to him by the Supreme Pastor, of feeding, governing, and directing the whole flock of Christ, has thought proper to make a certain alteration in the form of our ecclesiastical government. To deny this spiritual power, to refuse to acknowledge this spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, we need not tell you would be to renounce our faith and cease to be Catholics. The laws of England are fully cognisant of this fact; and hence, in tendering to us the oath of allegiance, they qualify the wording of that oath so as not to compel us to deny the spiritual power and supremacy of our Holy Father. If, then, in the exercise of his acknowledged right, he has thought proper, for good and wise reasons, and after mature deliberation, to impart to us that more regular and canonical form of church government which exists in almost every other part of the Catholic world, where is the "assumption," where is the "audacity," where is the "illegality" of his conduct, so much complained of?

We are told that by the establishment of our new hierarchy Pope Pius IX. has invaded and ignored the Queen's spiritual supremacy, and that we are equally guilty in acceding to his arrangements. Does, then, our Gracious Queen expect his Holiness to believe in her spiritual supremacy? Does she even compel us to acknowledge the same? Do not our calumniators themselves well know that, during the darksome days of persecution, the rack and the gibbet were tried upon our forefathers in vain to compel them to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign? and that, should those darksome days return, we must, like them, consent to be hung, drawn, and quartered, rather than acknowledge that supremacy? In making this plain and open avowal, we fear not to alarm the prejudices of the candid portion of our fellow-countrymen. Even those who are now exciting the feelings of the mob against us know full well that our rule and motto in these matters has ever been, "Give to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, but to God what belongs to God." (Matt. xxii.) We know how to render temporal obedience in things temporal to our earthly Sovereign, and spiritual obedience in things spiritual to God and his Vicegerent, without letting these duties clash or interfere with each other. In making this assertion we are fully borne out by the conduct and behaviour of English Catholics for the last three hundred years.

But much stress is laid upon the fact that a new division of the country has been made into certain dioceses, and bishops appointed to govern their respective portions of the flock residing within these newly-defined limits. This, it is urged, is virtually taking possession of the country, and disposing of the territories of Queen Victoria. It is difficult to understand how persons can be found who are serious in preferring such a charge against us. If, however, any such there be, we can only solemnly assure them that no assumption of temporal power, no claim to territorial possession or worldly property, has been conten-

plated in the establishment of our hierarchy. As vicars apostolic, formerly, we had no claim but upon your voluntary donations; as bishops in ordinary now, we have acquired no right to a single broad acre or an additional stiver, even from our own flocks, much less from those who do not belong to us.

We are persuaded that when the present frantic ebullition shall have subsided, and our fellow-countrymen have dispassionately reviewed their present excited feelings, they will see that they have been led astray by exaggerated statements and terrified by imaginary dangers.

We would observe, moreover, that whereas we have hitherto been taunted and reproached with our foreign titles, ridiculed as mere "titulars," "creatures of the Pope," and destitute of all independent episcopal power and character, all these anomalies have been removed in the establishment of our hierarchy; by which we have become more free, more canonically constituted, more national, and, if we may so express it, more English. The Holy See, in fact, so far from wishing to outrage the feelings of the country, has studiously avoided any infraction of the laws, has merged a portion of its own direct power, by our new appointments, and has taken pains to ascertain that those appointments would give no umbrage to the British Government.

While, therefore, dearly beloved, we express our gratitude to his Holiness for the favour and distinction wherewith he has honoured us, let us fervently pray that, in due time, those of our countrymen whose prejudices and jealousies have been unfairly excited may see how they have been misled, may lay aside the groundless terrors with which they have been artfully impressed, and be generously disposed to allow us quietly to enjoy that religious liberty which they claim for themselves, and which they profess to be the birth-right of every Englishman.

In conclusion, dearly beloved, come what may—however the storm may rage and our enemies revile us—be not faint-hearted; but remembering that you are the disciples of Him "who, when he was reviled did not revile; when he suffered, threatened not, but delivered Himself to him that judged Him unjustly" (2 Pet. ii. 23); bear patiently the calumnies and obloquy heaped upon you; "love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you" (Matt. v. 44). And if in so doing you fail to "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" (2 Pet. ii. 15), still, "be glad and rejoice, for your reward is great in heaven" (Matt. v. 12); for this, says the Apostle, is "a grace, if for conscience towards God a man endures sorrow, suffering wrongfully" (1 Pet. ii. 19).

"Peace be to the brethren, and charity with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen." (Ephesians vi. 22.)

WILLIAM, Bishop of Northampton.

Given at Northampton, Nov. 5.

P.S. We request that this Pastoral be read in every church and chapel in our diocese on the first Sunday after its reception, and that after Mass the "Te Deum" be said or sung in Latin or English; followed by the prayer for the Queen, Quæsumus, or the prayer, "O God, by whom kings reign," &c.

THE BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH AND LORD FEILDING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"SIR,—As there are many persons anxious to know the reasons which have induced me to withhold my new church from the Anglican communion, for whose service it had originally been destined, I venture to express a hope that you will allow the following letter, written to the Bishop of St. Asaph, to appear in the columns of your next edition. It will best explain my conduct in this matter.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Downing, Holywell, Nov. 13."

"FEILDING.

We are very happy to afford Lord Feilding an opportunity of explaining his conduct in this extraordinary affair; but, in order that the public may have the whole case before them, we prefix to his lordship's letter the correspondence that led to it, which has been forwarded to us embodied in a statement entitled—

AN APPEAL TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(Copy.)

St. Asaph, Oct. 21, 1850.

"MY DEAR LORD,—As it is now some time since I had the honour of writing to you with regard to the church at Pantasa, and since I have as yet received no answer, I will venture to place before you the following considerations, hoping that they may not come too late, and that you have not in this matter made up your mind without looking at the view which they who think differently from you must take of the subject. For I cannot help regarding it as a promise made to me and my clergy, as well as to our Divine Master.

"You publicly declared that you purposed to bestow a large sum of money in founding

a church and all things belonging to it. You invited me and my clergy to join in laying the foundation. You seemed to understand it so. We certainly understood it so, and we received the Lord's Supper together with this understanding.

"Now I must say, that I regard this as a promise made to me and my clergy as solemnly as it could be made on earth.

"You subsequently came to my house, and we consulted in private, as friends, as to how you could best carry out what I considered as fully settled between us. And I would ask—How you could have made a more solemn promise, as far as I and my clergy are concerned? If any one had asked me to advance money on such a promise I should have readily done it, according to my means. If I had done so you no doubt would now repay me the money. I am not doubting you, but your view of the subject. If any cautious adviser had at that time suggested that I should do well to induce you to bind yourself legally to your promise I should have resented the suggestion as an insult to my friend, and your own feelings must have gone with mine.

"There is another view of the question which I must take. I have received the following letter from Dr. Briscoe:—

" 'Whitford, Holywell, Oct. 16.

"MY LORD,—I am anxious to know whether your lordship has received any communication from Lord Feilding respecting Pantasa.

"In the month of May, 1845, I went to Brighton, to stay a few days on a visit to the late Lady Emma Pennant, who was then confined by illness to her room. On that occasion her ladyship communicated to me her desire and intention of building and endowing a church at Pantasa, in the event of her life being spared; and at the same time she turned to her daughter (now Lady Feilding) and said emphatically to her, 'Louisa, now you will remember that?' Her daughter accordingly acquiesced. In fact, Lady Emma dwelt on the hope of establishing a church there as a matter on which she had fully set her heart.

"For several years previously she had also felt a warm interest in the spiritual welfare of the district of Pantasa, knowing, as she did, its remoteness from church, and the poverty of its inhabitants.

"I have several of her letters, and they prove that her heart and soul's wish was to live to the glory of God her Saviour, and to do what good she could in her generation.

"Believe me to be, my lord,

"Your faithful servant,

"RICHARD BRISCOE."

"Now, I presume that the money which would have been expended on this church was derived from Lady Emma Pennant, and that in the foundation thus undertaken you intended to carry out her views; so that you will easily understand what I mean by saying that I conceive that I have a moral claim that the daughter shall carry out the wish thus solemnly expressed by a dying mother; for there can be no doubt that Lady Emma Pennant intended the foundation to be connected with the Church of England.

"There are stories prevalent in this country as to a fixed sum devoted by Lady Emma Pennant to this purpose: but, as I understand that you have denied any knowledge of the 6,000*l.* or 7,000*l.* being so appropriated, I take it for granted that the appropriation of a definite sum is a mistake. But I do not see how this alters the nature of the promise made by Lady Emma Pennant.

"I must leave you to draw your own conclusions from these premises, lest I should seem to make any unreasonable claim; and I do not venture to express what I myself think, for you must be aware how very painful it is to me to write on such a subject to your lordship. But I have no alternative.

"Depend upon it that whatever gives you pain will give me pain, but it would add to the grief which I now feel for what you have done, if I were forced to conclude that in this worldly matter you had acted in a manner which I, as your friend, must deplore.

"Believe me, my dear lord, yours truly,

"THOMAS VOWLER ST. ASAPH.

"To Viscount Feilding."

"Downing, Oct. 30, 1850.

"MY DEAR LORD,—I have hitherto refrained from giving a final answer to your lordship's inquiries respecting the destination of S. Dewi's Church, now in course of building at Pantasaph, in order that I might be able seriously, carefully, and dispassionately to weigh all the circumstances of the case, both as they presented themselves to my own mind and as they had been laid before me by your lordship and others.

"Fearing also to act upon my own unassisted judgment, I have taken time to obtain the opinions of many whom I considered capable of giving sound and just advice.

"The result has been, that my own previous opinion has been unanimously confirmed, viz., that were I to carry out, under present circumstances, the intention which I undeniably had of giving up S. Dewi's to the 'Church of England,' I should be sinning in the face of God, and acting inconsistently before men.

“ I will now endeavour, as briefly as possible, to explain why I should consider this to be the case.

“ Lady Feilding and I designed this church for a thank-offering to Almighty God on our marriage; and, naturally enough believing the Established Church of England to be Catholic, and consequently the authorised teacher and exemplar of God’s whole truth as delivered by Himself to his Apostles, intended fully to give it to her through you, her appointed ministers, and the imparters of those truths supposed to be maintained by her, as soon as the building was fit for consecration.

“ Subsequently, however, the awful truth forced itself upon us that we had been mistaken all our lives as to what really was God’s truth, and we became convinced, not only that the Anglican communion was not Catholic, but that it even protested against and denied many of God’s most holy truths. We therefore felt ourselves bound to separate from her, and to submit to the true Catholic and Apostolic Church.

“ Being essentially ‘ Protestant,’ the Anglican communion, while it holds some Catholic verities, is bound to vindicate its position of antagonism by ‘ protesting’ against others, and those most vital ones. Consequently every faithful Anglican clergyman is bound to preach against them. Such being the case, were I to fulfil my intention to the letter as it was expressed, and deliver up this church to a communion essentially antagonistic, and therefore anti-Catholic, I should be denying that holy Catholic faith by my deeds which I professed with my heart and my mouth. In fact, I should be guilty of the grossest inconsistency, and be acting a lie in the face of God and man.

“ Your lordship speaks of my expressed intention as of a pledged promise, by which I am morally, and might have been legally, bound. As to the latter, I think I am right in saying that no church built at the free cost and sole expense of a single individual is ever irrevocably made over to the Church of England during the lifetime of the donor, until the deed of gift is signed at the time of consecration.

“ As to the former opinion expressed in your lordship’s letter—that I am morally irrevocably bound to ‘ you and your clergy’—according to your reasoning I was bound to you personally, irrespective of your capacities as teachers of God’s truth, and should therefore have been equally bound to give it to you, had you all become Arians or Socinians in the meantime. Yet no one, I think, would insist upon that, nor, indeed, could such have been the case. But, however it may have borne the nature of a promise, I need not refer your lordship to holy Scripture to prove that there may be promises which to fulfil under certain circumstances is sin.

“ St. Paul did not, after his conversion, consider himself bound by the promise which he had made to the Jewish synagogue, that he would do his utmost to crush the rising Christian Church at Damascus. And why? Because he made it in ignorance.

“ *Surely if all promises and pledges are to be kept sacred under all conceivable circumstances, you will not easily justify the act of King Henry VIII., in alienating the noble Cathedrals and Churches in this land from the intentions and services to which they had so solemnly been dedicated.*

“ *By parity of reasoning, if it were incumbent on me to deliver up S. Dewi’s Church for Protestant worship, it would be equally the bounden duty of the country to deliver up Westminster Abbey and other noble structures to that Catholic Church, for whose service they had originally been erected.* It is needless to adduce other examples. My duty appears clear to me, viz., to devote that church which is being built at my own cost, and which yet remains mine, to the furtherance of God’s truth as I find he himself delivered it to his holy Catholic Church. I ought to state further, that the money left by Lady Emma Pennant in her will (3,000*l.*, not 7,000*l.*), to be, as she expressed it, applied ‘ for such spiritual and Church purposes in the parishes of Whitford and Holywell . . . or either of them, as they, my said executors, together with my said daughter . . . shall in their . . . discretion think proper,’ not only yet remains untouched and unappropriated (with the exception of 200*l.* which I advanced some time ago to Whitford Church), but has actually not as yet become available, it being dependant upon the falling in of certain annuities. None of the 10,000*l.* devoted by me to S. Dewi’s has been drawn from her funds.

“ I am well aware that Lady Emma earnestly desired that a church should be built at that end of Whitford parish; and, when we proposed to erect one, she suggested Pantasaph as the locality most desirable for the site. She, however, made no arrangements, nor left any directions, either verbal or testamentary, for devoting any money specifically for that purpose.

“ And now, my dear lord, I have replied fully, I think, to all your propositions. If, in so doing, I may appear to have spoken at all offensively or rudely, I crave your pardon, and desire to assure you that such was far from my intention. The importance of the case requires that I should express myself plainly; and that is all I have endeavoured to do, being wishful to conceal nothing.

“ I feel that many expressions which I have been compelled to use must give you pain, but, believe me, it gives me even more pain to write them than it will you to read them. God is my witness, that my only desire is to do His holy will as far as I see it; and, save where my conscience precludes me, I desire to meet your lordship’s least wishes in everything.

"I dare not be wanting in the fulfilment of my duty towards God, even at the risk of forfeiting the good opinion of men: and I trust you will do me the justice to believe that, in acting as I do, I am following solely the dictates of my own conscience, desiring and praying only to be directed by Him who is the way, the truth, and the life.

"That He may lead us both to see and to do His holy will in all things, as long as He vouchsafes to spare us in this world, is my continual and most fervent prayer.

"Believe me, my dear lord,

"To be ever, with the deepest veneration and respect,

"Your lordship's faithful friend and servant,

"*The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph*"

"FEILDING.

"From the above letters it will be seen, that a building which was founded with a promise of its being appropriated to the Church of England is now, notwithstanding the presumed engagements entered into at the time of its foundation, to be alienated for Romish purposes.

"Under these painful circumstances, the Vicars of Whitford and Holywell, anxious to supply the spiritual wants of the district, which was to have been assigned to it, and which is now threatened with the intrusion of the Romish schism, have resolved, with the full concurrence and sanction of the Lord Bishop of the diocese, to make an earnest appeal to the members of the Church, in the hope that they may be enabled to raise sufficient funds to build and endow a district church, and to erect a school-room and parsonage, in lieu of those which have thus been alienated.

"The district to be annexed to the proposed church will include that part of the parish of Whitford within which the building referred to is situated, and a large portion of the parish of Holywell. It will contain a population of about 2,000, consisting almost entirely of miners, labourers, and small farmers, all of whom live at a considerable distance from any church.

"In proof of the great need of additional spiritual provision for this mountain district, it may be added, that the population of the parish of Holywell alone exceeds 11,000, for which there are only two churches and one licensed room, all at a very inconvenient distance from the proposed district; and that, besides its remoteness from the two parish churches, the spiritual wants of its Welsh-speaking population cannot be adequately provided for in these, as, owing to the co-existence of two languages, there can be but one Welsh service in each of them on the Lord's-day.

"As the inhabitants of the district are unable, through their poverty, to provide a church for themselves, there is no other way by which this want can be met but by means of this general appeal, which it is fervently hoped will not be made in vain.

"Subscriptions will be thankfully received by either of the undersigned, or at the North and South Wales Bank, Holywell, or the London and Westminster Bank, London.

"RICHARD BRISCOE, D.D., Vicar of Whitford.

"November 11."

"HUGH JONES, M.A., Vicar of Holywell.

"SUBSCRIPTION PROMISED:—

"The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph £100 0 0"

THE VATICAN MASQUERADE.

"Fulham is a snug place—a *very* snug place. If there is a comfort, a convenience, a creature luxury, to be come by from any quarter of the globe, or capable of contrivance by the busy brain of obsequious inventiveness, there it will be found. If there is a softer sofa, a more downy bed, an easier carriage, a racier vintage, a more luscious conservatory, a better contrived kitchen-range, an ampler buttery-hatch in the world than another, it will be met with at the palace of the metropolitan see. The Bishop of London admires money—has a respect for it; but for all that he is 'regardless of expense,' when he regards himself. Good folks are scarce—in mercy to mankind, the excellent man is careful of his precious health. Celibacy is a damnable Popish error; therefore the Bishop of London is married. He has sons and daughters, and has given them all, with admirable self-sacrifice, to his country. 'He that provideth not for his own, especially those of his own household, hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.' The Bishop of London is a *father* of the faith, and is *better* than an infidel. He provides for his own sons prebendal stalls and deaneries, and for his daughters by making archdeacons of their husbands. He possesses a *saving* grace, as will in due time be proved by the probate of his will and the amount of the legacy-duty. He is taught to love his enemies—and his enemies, we are told in the catechism, are 'the devil, the world, and the flesh.' He is a pattern of 'practical godliness' in the management of his revenues and his patronage; and a bright example of the (modest) 'assurance of faith.' He is an encourager of the (Protestant) Arts; and in his banquet-hall, groaning with gold plate, the choicest delicacies of the season, and the finest wines in Europe, he has an engraving of the picture of 'Melancthon discovering the luxury of the monks.' To whom could the 'Holy Catholic Church' turn, in this her extremity, with so much comfort, as to this 'flower of Christendom?' To whom, with such pro-

priety, could be addressed the 'groans of the Britons' in this modern invasion of Rome? Of whom could the Bishop of Westminster be so appropriately the foil as the Bishop of London? Cardinal Wiseman is married to nothing but his sacred office—the heretic! He provideth not for his own, nor for his own household—neither a door-keeper's place for his flunkey, nor a berth in the Customs for his butler—the infidel! He has neither sons nor daughters, except his flock—and has not the saving grace to keep the little that he gets, but spends as freely as he receives, and has not even the sense to let his left hand know what his right hand doeth. He has no patronage to bestow, except that which it is a self-sacrifice and renunciation of the world to accept; and with neither tithes to levy by distress, nor Church-rates to collect by the broker's man, and he is not worth a groat that is not voluntarily given him. If the 'impudent' pretensions of Rome to spiritual dominion in England involved a claim to seize Church property, to levy from the people, by force of bailiff and Queen's Bench warrants, 'title of all they possess;' to renew leases at enormous premiums to be paid to one's self, and at nominal rents to be received by one's successor; to regard the cure of souls as a 'living,' a sacred office as a 'benefice,' and the holder of it as an 'incumbent;' to be silent when the flock were in peril, and howl out the scream of the 'Church in danger,' whenever there was any doubt about the possession of the fleece, we should understand what Cardinal Wiseman would be at, and would no longer be 'uneasy in our minds.' But 'the Man of Sin, and the Son of Perdition,' as the Church of Scotland, with its characteristic and usual charity, styles the Pope, as an agreeable variation of epithet and sex from that of the ——— of Babylon, asks none of these things. He leaves all temporal things to the Anglican Church. He desires neither the aid of the law nor the powers of the Constitution, neither the *prestige* of social influence nor the authority of political institutions, to help him. He says to Episcopacy, 'Keep my money, my endowments, my Church property, of which you have robbed me, on false pretences, in the name of the people of England, while you withhold it from *them*, and retain it to *yourselves*. I seek only the privilege of the appeal of soul to soul, and mind to mind, conceded by your Druids and heathen kings when my predecessors came among them and converted them to Christianity—which the very Athenians granted to Paul when, on Mar's Hill, he scoffed at their idols—which the worshippers of Olympus, at Corinth and Colossé, at Ephesus and Thessaly, vouchsafed to the Apostles. By the free will of your fellow-citizens, I send my spiritual ambassadors among you, at their earnest solicitation and with their most reverent allegiance. If you call them superstitious, they have a right to be superstitious. If you say they are idolators, the law permits them to worship idols if they please; and in this is no more tolerant than Darius when he suffered Daniel to bow down before Jehovah, or Pharaoh when he made Joseph the heretic his minister.' We are not surprised at the addresses, and meetings, and Pastoral Charges, and Zion College gatherings, and archidiaconal convocations, and the diarrhœa of *Times* and *Chronicle* letters from indignant correspondents, which such an act has called forth. If by such purely intellectual and spiritual influences as the Roman Catholic hierarchy possesses, without either purse, scrip, political position, or recognition by the State, they can make the English people Papists, why let them—the people should be Papists if they have a mind to be so. If with the whole influence of the State, the entire powers of the Constitution, the whole dynamics of the social authority, the rank, the property, the official example and support, and the enormous ecclesiastical revenues of this kingdom at their back, the English hierarchy cannot keep their flocks within their fold, or prevent them from desertion to Popery, armed only with the naked privilege of free speech and spiritual influences, that is a conclusive sign that English Episcopacy is in peril, and Popery is the real faith of the British people. If Anglicanism has anything to fear from the use of mere names, then itself must be but a name, having no real root in the human soul and the national heart. Calling a man Bishop of Westminster, in place of Bishop of Mesopotamia, will not *make* him Bishop of Westminster, any more than little Keely is crowned King of the Cannibal Islands merely by acting as the *Illustrious Stranger*. There were Catholic Bishops of Montreal, Quebec, Louisiana, long before a Protestant set foot in America. *We* have usurped *their* titles; what right have we to complain that they have—not usurped ours, for there is no Anglican Bishop of Westminster, but changed false titles into real ones? Presbytery is the established form of the government of the Church in Scotland, where Prelacy was formally suppressed by law. Yet the Scottish Episcopalians have formally revived the ancient titular Bishoprics, have parcelled out the kingdom into their traditional ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and their Bishops and Clergy describe, in their official documents, their dissenting sect as 'the Church in Scotland.' Nay, they have received Government grants in their ecclesiastical capacity. Our Queen has not hesitated to appoint an Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, without asking the leave of Sir Moses Montefiore, and in defiance of the Mohammedan priesthood. It is no apology for doing violence to the religious feelings of the Turkish people, and usurping the rights of the Mussulman hierarchy, that the Sultan has permitted it. *We* would not suffer the Queen to confer a similar privilege upon the Pope, without the consent of the nation; and that consent the powers that be are too intolerant to concede. The time has come when it is essential that the people should dis-

tinctly ascertain whether the English Church is a mere material property or a spiritual institution, for the enlightenment and moral elevation of the community. As a public property it belongs to the public. Under its management pauperism, ignorance, drunkenness, depravity, crime, have increased in a quite geometrical proportion. Even infidelity has frightfully advanced among the masses of the people. In many instances, where men have held fast by religion, they have abandoned the Church for dissenting sects; and the present panic among the clergy appears to demonstrate that neither their own influence nor the principles of their creed have secured the ends they were to subserve, but that Protestant ascendancy has had the effect of strengthening and widening the reign of the Romish Propaganda. In *Puff's* tragedy, *Don Whiskerandos*, through three acts, disguises himself as a beef-eater. At the climax of the plot, the leader of the armada throws off his cloak, and, thumping his palm on a fine waistcoat, demands, 'Am I a beef-eater now, sir?' Is it the fine waistcoat that changes the character of Cardinal Wiseman? Is he less or more a beef-eater because his cloak covers gold lace, or the want of it reveals the embroidery? He is either not Don Whiskerandos now, or he was not a beef-eater then. Tilbury Fort was not taken for all the waistcoat. Westminster is not Romanised for all the Papal brief. There is now a (Popish) Bull-beef-eater in Westminster, in addition to an ox-beef-eater at Fulham. Do not let us be misunderstood. We cannot afford to ridicule the pretensions of Popery. It is spreading among the higher classes and in the bosom of the Established Church with most discouraging rapidity; it is flying through the Anglican priesthood and hierarchy with the universality of a murrain and the malignity of a rot; it seizes upon the squalid and the ignorant with the most pertinacious and epidemical tenacity, because its pastors are faithful, laborious, devoted, self-denying in their office, the comforters, the kind guardians, the self-sacrificing shepherds of the poor, the wretched and the world-forsaken, braving typhus, and cholera, and famine, not by proxy, not by hired town missionaries, and 15s. a-week Bible-readers, but in their own persons. While we have been wrangling about godless colleges and secular education, ignorance has been spreading, and superstition is the religion of ignorance. It is not by making men Protestants, but by making them intelligent, that we can save them from the Pope; it is not by promoting Anglican episcopacy that we can keep men Protestants. Prelacy is the high road to Rome, as is established beyond controversy by the fact that the faith of the English clergy has carried and is carrying them to Papacy, not in solitary perversions, but by the almost open apostasy of whole dioceses, and by the shameless avowal of many who are too sordid to abandon their livings for the spiritual luxury of keeping a conscience. We would sound the alarm of the Popish invasion as loudly as most. Still, if Protestant Christianity cannot maintain its ground in public opinion against such a theocracy as Cardinal Wiseman, then orthodox evangelism cannot be true; because the very test and sign of truth are its victory in the arena of intelligence over all the subtle artifices, and all the Britannia-metal counterfeits of error. To go to the throne, or to the Legislature, and to claim the exertion, against the purely moral and spiritual encroachments of Popery, of the vulgar brute force of the law, and of that mere carnal weapon, the civil sword of the executive, is a denial of the first principles of religious liberty, and a confession of weakness and defeat. At least, before established orthodoxy can enter its plaint in this great suit, it must come into court with clean hands—it must renounce its own Popery, Puseyism, Anglicanism, before it can ignore the pretensions of a more consistent and ingenuous litigant. Upon a competition of the rival pretenders, we trust the honest public will calmly, and without interference, look, with imperturbable passivity, and suffer one spiritual disease to eat another out, as the most homœopathic method. Where the essential difference lies betwixt raising up spiritual and ecclesiastical authorities *within* the kingdom who deny and utterly set aside the Queen's authority in matters of religion, and owning voluntarily the existence of such a power *without* the kingdom, it is for the Methodist Conference, the Scotch Bishops, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and the central conclave of the Free Kirk, of the Synod of Ulster, or of the Remonstrant Synod, to point out. The late expulsion of the recusant Methodist preachers by the sole authority of the Committee, and in defiance of the voice of the people, is a pretty clear proof that it is not the Roman Catholics alone who raise up and own the sovereignty of an ecclesiastical power totally independent of, and in rivalry to, the mere royal authority. That one man *calls* himself, or is called by others, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and another the Superintendent of the Welsh District, the Bishop of Edinburgh, or Moderator of the Synod of Merse and Teviot, or of Ulster, cannot surely establish any essential difference of constructive usurpation, unless, indeed, Episcopacy is entitled to a monopoly of grievance, merely because 'Archbishop' is an office incident to its constitution."—*Weekly Dispatch*.

The 51st Thousand, price only 1s. sewed, or 1s. 6d. bound (postage free, 4d. extra), with a very useful steel-plate Genealogical Chart of the Sovereigns of England,

OUTLINES OF ENGLISH HISTORY.

WITH

Interesting Remarks on Manners, Customs, Arts, Dresses, &c.

BY HENRY INCE, M.A.

* * In consequence of the rapidly extended sale and approval of this Work, every page of the present Edition has been carefully extended and much improved. By a judicious enlargement of the width and length of the page, one-third more letter-press is introduced, without any increase of price.

"In the system of Education sufficient regard is not always paid to impressing on the pupil's mind the leading points in a branch of study. His memory is confused with a too great variety of details. This manual of Mr. Ince's is well calculated to counteract this defective method, by affording a well-digested outline, which should be carefully committed to memory, and afterwards filled up by means of oral instruction or reference to larger works. Lively chapters of historical memoranda, and brief sketches of manners and customs, are appropriately introduced. We can cordially recommend this well-digested manual."—*Sharpe's Magazine*.

"A neat and accurate compendium, and written with perspicuity. The events of each reign are arranged under different heads, so as to give, at a glance, a comprehensive view of the whole."—*Athenæum*.

"A new edition, with improvements. It is a little 'Rapin' in its way, a history condensed into a nutshell; and we feel assured will, with its companion works, form the future text-book of the young of both sexes. Works intended for the mental culture of the young are sure to meet our approval when properly deserving it; and in the present instance we feel inclined to extend the usual limit of our remarks in favour of the lucid and well-arranged books which Mr. Ince has issued for the rising generation. We could not forbear a smile on glancing over their contents, at the recollection of the sundry fat quartos and huge folios through which in boyhood we were obliged to wade for the acquirement of a less amount of information than is here presented within the space of one hundred pages."—*The Mirror*.

"Well-digested and useful Outlines of our History, and deserves to be a standard educational work."—*Eclectic Review*.

"Superior to anything of the kind; here is a clear and comprehensive Outline of the whole History of England. We cordially recommend it."—*Wesley Banner*.

"This book is not undeserving of the popularity it has obtained; it is full of information, and contains the substance of more knowledge of the social progress, manners, and customs of our ancestors than many works of far larger pretensions."—*The third review of the Athenæum*.

"Both the plan and style are perspicuous; it is admirably adapted for what it is intended."—*The Times*.

"A great deal of information in a small compass, and the Author has availed himself of the latest authorities. We prefer the form of Outlines to Catechisms. It contributes to the formation of more logical views, both by the teacher and scholar. Catechisms are the school-books of parrots."—*Spectator*.

Price 1s. sewed, or 1s. 4d. bound, the 11th Thousand of

OUTLINES OF GENERAL KNOWLEDGE.

BY HENRY INCE, M.A.

"The Outlines of General Knowledge embrace a great variety of facts connected with the natural sciences. Even the names of all the divisions into which the moderns have classified knowledge, fill no inconsiderable space. Add to them the names and height of mountains, and names and length of rivers, the names of constellations, the names of the chemical elements, the amount of population of the different kingdoms of the world, the amount of their respective taxation per head, &c., &c., and the mere nomenclature seems calculated to fill a tolerably large book. All this, and more than this, is collected in Mr. Ince's Outlines, and those not accustomed to the art of the author will wonder how one small head could carry all he has brought together."—*The Economist*.

"Well-digested Outlines, which should be committed to everybody's memory."—*Sharpe's Magazine*.

"Contains for its size a remarkable quantity of interesting and well-arranged information. It would make a valuable present to Sunday Schools and lending libraries."—*Athenæum*.

"A well-digested compendium, or 'militum in parvo' of useful knowledge."—*Eclectic Review*.

"An excellent Encyclopædia in miniature—let it be extensively introduced into families, schools, and lending libraries."—*Wesley Banner*.

"Contains a considerable amount of information of a very valuable kind, on a variety of subjects, that in ordinary routine of education are too much overlooked, an acquaintance with which is every day becoming more and more indispensable. They are gems which cannot fail to vegetate in the mind, to fructify in the head, and eventually to produce a four-fold reward to him who labours in the acquisition of them."—*Sunday School Magazine*.

"Calculated to instruct any one of common intelligence on every known topic of importance, and to start him with a mind stored with the accumulated learning of 6,000 years."—*The Mirror*.

In 18mo, price 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. bound (postage free, 4d. extra),

THE SIXTH EDITION OF

OUTLINES OF FRENCH HISTORY.

BROUGHT DOWN TO 1850.

With Notices of the Manners, Customs, Arts, &c., of the different Periods.

BY HENRY INCE, M.A.

"It affords a very pleasing view of the whole History of France. The author being gifted with a philosophical mind and a classical taste, the subjects, though treated in a detached, are far from being treated in a dry and unentertaining manner."—*The Times*.

"It is embellished with some capital engravings, and abounds in the narration of those romantic events which form the groundwork of so many delightful works."—*The Mirror*.

"Mr. Ince is not of those men who speak much without saying anything; he says much in a few words."—*French paper*.

"A very useful educational work."—*Literary Gazette*.

LONDON: JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER - ROW.

Orders received by all Booksellers, Stationers, &c.

SALISBURY, PRINTER, PRIMROSE HILL, SALISBURY-SQUARE, FLEET-STREET.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

AN APPEAL, BY JOHN BULL;
SPEECH OF THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF BRISTOL; AND
THE QUEEN AND THE POPE.

A PLAIN APPEAL

TO THE
COMMON SENSE OF ALL THE MEN AND WOMEN OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.*

FELLOW CITIZENS,—“Should this meet the eye” of any crazy victim of the newspaper gin, or platform brandy, which is now sedulously administered to all who desire to get mentally drunk, by able editors, prime ministers, lawn sleeves, and shovel hats, let him return it to the publisher, and take his money back again. It would thrive as ill with me as Peter’s pence in the pocket of the Bishop of London. I address neither those who are bitten by the mad-dog of polemical theology, tainted with the Scotch fiddle of pious excitement, tormented in their rest with the bugs of bigotry, nor over-run with the industrious fleas of fanaticism. There is no cure for the mange of the British lion, no specific for the spiritual *morbus pediculosis* called a clergy. I must leave the patient to be eaten up by his parasites, and wish them a hearty appetite and better taste. They must have stout stomachs, and the digestion of an ostrich.

The Greek citizen governed the roaring throats of the unreasoning rabble by exclaiming, “Strike; but hear me!” Mr. Miall has been struck, but he has not been heard. Parsons are proverbially cowards, and fear is always cruel. Howled on by panic-stricken priests, Englishmen have forgotten their character for fair play. They make a “clear stage” only to the rector, and show “no favour” solely to his respondents. The platform has for the time ceased to be the justice-seat of public opinion, and has been converted by the self-styled ministers of the Gospel of Peace into a mere arena for the scuffles of a parson-fuddled mob. I would speak to you the words of truth and soberness, were you not blown up into a froth and scum by the prevailing “trade winds” of those who by this craft have their wealth. Faction is the madness of the many for the gain of the few; and the many, until butter of soft sawder and the brimstone of denunciation effect their cure, must for the time be suffered to run their course—

“That rubbing the poor itch of their opinion
Make themselves scabs.”

You have established a censorship of the tongue, and denied to your neighbours the liberty of speech. The pen is not yet gagged, and, until it be, I shall use it freely.

An ingenious ethnologist has divided mankind into two great genera—those who have been hanged, and those who have not. An equally subtle classification has been suggested by theologians, partaking less of the nature of a discovery than of that of an *invention*. Deans and curates parcel out our population into the very simple denominations of Catholics and Protestants; and as, in all controversies with Dissenters, they claim all as Churchmen who do not go to chapel, so, in this day of their tribulation, they find it exceedingly convenient to reckon all who are not Papists as practitioners of the principles of the Reformation. In this way they manage to constitute a sect of Roman Protestants as well as Roman Catholics; for it may be remembered that the policy of the “Mistress of the Ancient World” was to secure—as their allies to effect their present conquests—those whom they intended afterwards to enslave, “as a monkey keeps apples in the corner of his jaw—the first mouthed is the last swallowed.” Mr. Gathercole is silent. We hear no more the flattering announcement, “that all Dissenters are animated by the spirit of the Devil, and that the curse of God rests heavily upon them.” The “sin of schism” is no longer whispered in the “ears polite” of practicable Independents. Baptists who can be “managed” will find a sudden pause in the eloquence of curates in their denunciations of “unauthorised teachers,” “vulgar meeting-house pulpiteurs,” and “greedy Gospellers.” Even the words “Church” and “Dissent” will be suppressed in the vocabulary of agitation, and the sects which to the Establishment have been, hitherto, *anathema*

* This very spirited article, from the pen of a well-known Protestant author and debater, is written expressly for appearance in this series of pamphlets on the “Roman Catholic Question.”

Fourth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution. James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row
Of whom may be had “The Roman Catholic Question,” Nos. I., II., and III.

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS’ HALL.

maramatha, will be embraced on the "common ground of the glorious principles of the Reformation." Thus the horse let the man on his back that he might be revenged upon the lion; but when the king of beasts was killed, the man refused to dismount, and the horse could never afterwards get the bit out of his mouth. Let Canterbury kill Rome, and where will the jack-ass of Dissent be, when he has suffered one of his enemies to mount him that he may help him to destroy the other? If honest men would keep their own, they will let rogues fall out. If your foes are foes to each other, you have but to step aside, and the Kilkenny cats will bite and scratch till not even their tails are "to the fore." To help priest against priest is but to make one powerful Pope out of two powerless persons. When the Jew and the Quaker were locked up together, it was found at the end of a week that there was no Jew left, but only a very fat Quaker. Beware of letting London and Exeter get fat by feeding them on Cardinals. They are not very dainty in their diet, provided they get enough. When they have dined on Rome, they will take Dissenters for dessert.

What, defined by the synonyms of history, is Popery! Theology in power. What is Protestantism? Parsondom stripped of State influence. It is not in the genius of a religion, but in the vices of human nature, that we are to look for the spirit of persecution and intolerance. The nature of a nation's faith is to be found in the character of its people, not as a cause but as an effect. We are spiritually free, not because we are Protestants, but because we love liberty; and we are emancipated from superstition, not according to the measure of our religion, but to the extent of our intelligence. Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, were once monks. Henry the Eighth and Titus Oates were Protestants. Sir Thomas More, Pascal, and Fenelon, were Catholics. The peculiar people of the One True God, who shuddered at idolatry, put the first Christian to death, and persecuted his followers "from city to city," Liberty and knowledge first planted their standard on the earth among the worshippers of Jupiter and Apollo, in the Grecian republics; and the Athenians heard with patient tolerance Paul denounce their idols on Mars Hill. Even Pontius Pilate refused to condemn Christ by the Roman law, and left him to the fate of rabbinical jurisprudence. Men are made persecutors, not by their principles, but by their passions. Give a sceptre to a president of the Methodist Conference, and he will become an inquisitor.

Catholic France chose Guizot, a Protestant, Prime Minister, and is now a free Republic. Catholic Belgium elects a Protestant King, and endows the Protestant churches; and because their pastors are married, pays to them double the allowance given to the national priesthood. British Dissenters endow the Anglican clergy, but groan in chorus at the whisper of a Maynooth grant; and would declare a republic if the Queen were to call Norfolk or Shrewsbury to her Cabinet. To compare for a moment the liberty of the subject in Protestant Prussia, and the Catholic Cantons of Switzerland, or among the Papists of the Netherlands, except for the purposes of contrast, would be as absurd as to liken the Bastille to the prairies.

Is Protestantism a spiritual doctrine, or a secular principle? It cannot mean a particular creed, because Episcopacy itself is fain to class within that convenient category the Church, the Baptist, the Independant, and the Methodist, the Ranter and the Unitarian, Swedenborg and Huntingdon, Muggleton and Barebones. It can only imply a social and political proposition, that conscience and opinion should be free, that the right of private judgment should be sacred, that in religion man should think what he pleases, and speak what he thinks, and that the nature of his faith should neither confer upon him privileges, nor subject him to disabilities which are not open and incident to all religious professors. That was the manifesto in support of which the Reformers entered their protest. "Christ," says Calvin, "is abolished with respect to us, unless our consciences continue in their liberty, from which they are certainly fallen if they can be ensnared in the bands of laws and ordinances, at the pleasure of men." Luther declares, "We have not received any authority or power to compel belief. . . . words and arguments are the only weapons of our warfare." Melancthon observes, "Let all have full liberty to teach and maintain whatever opinions they may choose to teach and maintain; let them all be listened to, and let them be judged by all." "No preacher," continues the Institutes of Calvin, "can require implicit belief to what he utters; only to the Word of God in the Scriptures." "The Scripture," adds Zuinglius, "explains itself, and has no need of an interpreter." "By the religion of Protestants," says Chillingworth, "I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon; . . . The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. . . . I am fully persuaded that God does not, and therefore man ought not, to require from any man more than this; to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to its commandments."

When the sage described to Rasselas the attributes required for the composition of a true poet, the prince interposed with the declaration, "I perceive there never was a poet in the world." Measure the foregoing definitions of the noun "Protestant" by the practice of its professors, and where will he find a Protestant?

"New presbyter," exclaims Milton, "is but old priest writ large." Religious reformers have been but impostors, wearing the fleece of the lamb to cover the pelt of the wolf. Papists more honest, if more brazen, assert the right of persecution; Protestants, more false if also more cunning, rise and thrive upon Catholic spoliation, by denouncing Popish principles, and outpractising their example. It is not the want of will, but the want of power, that

keeps men tolerant. Even Atheists persecute when unbelief is in office. We spend yearly treasures in converting Papists to Protestantism; we should fulfil the prior condition of converting Protestants to Christianity. We discovered the art of printing and put the Bible in the world's hands, but you cannot evangelise Europe by merely teaching it to read. Popery is consistent when it claims infallibility, dictates a creed to the soul, and withholds the Bible. But Protestantism, more cruel and less logical, gives mankind the Bible, and refuses to suffer them to interpret it for themselves. Calvin and Luther, fugitives or in danger, are Protestants in spirit—honoured by princes, and wielding the thunderbolts of state, they hurl them at all who disown their allegiance, and remain monks and Papists in all but in name. "Having freed yourselves," indignantly urges Dudith to Beza, "from the tyranny of Popish prelates, why do you turn ecclesiastical tyrants yourselves, and treat others with *barbarity and cruelty for only doing what you set them an example to do?* . . . Have you not been the constant panegyrist of such princes as have *depopulated whole districts for heresy?* Do you not daily teach that any who *appeal from your confessions to Scripture, ought to be punished by the secular power?* . . . You try to justify the banishment of Ochin, and the execution of many others. . . . When you talk of your Augsburg confession, and your Helvetic creed, and your unanimity and fundamental truths, I keep thinking of the sixth commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill.'" "Now," continues he to Wolff, "that the Calvinists have *burnt Servetus, and beheaded Gentilis, and murdered many others, and banished Bernard Ochin, with his wife and children, from your city in the depth of a sharp winter; now that the Lutherans have expelled Lasco, with the congregation of foreigners that came out of England with him, in an extremely rigorous season of the year; having done a great many such exploits, all contrary to the genius of Christianity, how, I ask, how shall we meet the Papists?*" Carolstadt, Luther's coadjutor, signed himself "Luther's exile, condemned without an hearing," on being banished by his brother Reformer "from city to city." Muezer was another of this first Protestant's victims. Calvin, to increase the tortures of Servetus, ordered the faggots to be made of green wood. Beza justified the act in two treatises, and declared, when "Servetus was put to death in this city, after a vain application of milder punishments, and when the treatise, so pious, learned, and elaborate, which John Calvin published in defence of that affair appeared not to satisfy the public mind, I took the same argument in hand." Melancthon published a similar justification, and threatened a denier of the devil with a dungeon and irons. Bucer was not even appeased by the faggots, but called for embowelling and tearing asunder of heretics.

These were the first Protestants, and this was the "dawn of the glorious Reformation." Step by step, and side by side, Reformers and Catholics persecuted in power, and preached toleration in adversity, until in England the burlesque of horror reached its climax in Catholic and Protestant burning side by side. Cranmer wrung from Edward VI. the death-warrant of Joan Bocher, a gentlewoman of Kent, for distributing copies of the Bible. Parre, Legate, Wightman, and many others, were burnt or beheaded by the Anglican Church. Biddle was only rescued by Cromwell from execution by the Puritans. Nonconformists were judicially murdered without mercy; recusants fined, imprisoned, kidnapped, and beheaded. The Protestant statutes, which may be read on our records, and many of which are still unrepealed, are filled with such pains and penalties against Quakers, Anabaptists, Unitarians, Papists, and Dissenters in general, as Draco might have blushed to sanction. The Scots' Acts attach the penalty of death to the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, and were enforced against a stripling of eighteen on the gallows in the Grassmarket of Edinburgh. While the misercant James II. and the monster Jefferies sold to the plantations, tortured, hanged, and quartered Dissenters, the Church encouraged and supported them with all its influence. When the Covenanters were, without distinction of age or sex, shot down on the moors like partridges, or drowned within high-water mark like rats, by Claverhouse's butchers, it was *Protestant episcopacy alone that did it*. When the Catholics of Glenco were murdered, even to the very infants, on the northern mountains, in the wild winter snows, by THEIR GUESTS, it was William III., the founder of the Hanoverian succession, who gave the order. The siege of Limerick, the confiscation of the whole Catholic property of Ireland, the imposition of the Anglican Establishment on that Popish country, the torture and execution of millions of its people *solely on account of their religious profession*, was entirely the work of the Protestant Church. Are you idiotic, or utterly omniscient, or entirely bereft of memory, or crazy? You bawl, "No Popery?"—"Down with the Pope?" Why? It is just twenty-one years since seven millions of Catholics were, solely on the ground of their theological opinions, denied the rights common to all British subjects, and were only emancipated in spite of the furious opposition of the Protestant establishments. It is just that time since, year after year, the bench of bishops refused to liberate the West-Indian slaves, or to deliver the staff of life from the fangs of the tax-gatherer. It is within a more recent period that they moved heaven, earth, and a place with which they claim to be more professionally familiar than either, to ignore the title of the people to representation. Has Mr. Binney or Dr. Cumming forgotten in spite of whose vehement protest it was that Protestant Dissenters were first permitted to possess civil rights, by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts? And, above all, has Mr. David Salomons so little remembered the past, and so utterly failed in the consciousness even of the present, as not to know that Baron Rothschild, because

he refuses to deny his faith, and to become an apostate, still stands on the threshold of Parliament, and finds the bench of bishops slapping-to the door in his face? IS IT, OR CAN IT BE ON ACCOUNT OF ANY CIVIL OR POLITICAL OBJECTION WHATSOEVER THAT EPISCOPACY STILL PERSECUTES THE JEWS? It is openly and distinctly avowed by the legal representatives of Protestantism, that it is solely on account of the religious opinions of the Hebrews that they are degraded from their civil rights. Then on what ground of consistency does Episcopacy call for penalties against the Catholics, for claiming for their hierarchy, or opinions, supremacy in the State?

Is history an old almanac? Do we require to rake up the ashes of the past to discover the glowing embers of Episcopal persecution? Fain would Churchmen entreat Dissenters to "wipe it up, and say no more about it." Abjectly, in the extremity of their craven fear, do they implore me to "kiss and be friends," to "sink all minor differences in a common danger," and to "forget and forgive!"

"Forget! forgive!"

I must indeed forget when I forgive!"

I need not look back. Measure the future by what is before you now. There is no such principle as Protestantism extant in existing practice; all are popes or popelings—Bunting, Philpotts, Knight Bruce, Charles James, Pio Nono, the General Assembly, the Remonstrant Synod, the Three Denominations, or the Queen, are all Pontiffs in their way. What is it to you, poor Jackass, which gains the victory? Will Wiseman put a heavier load in your panniers than Exeter and the spiritual courts? The records of the American colonies will prove to you that there is not a cruelty endured for conscience sake perpetrated by the Papists, that has not its parallel in the practices of the New England Puritans, and the proclamations of the Pilgrim Fathers. They but fled from persecution in the Old World, to persecute, in their turn, in the New. Nor is it necessary to go far a-field to discover Papists among Reformers, and the genuine spirit of the Vatican clothed in the integuments of a Protestant profession. There is not, there never was, a true Protestant Church in the world. The Pope has many enemies, but Popery is universally followed. The Queen is our Pontiff, confessedly supreme in matters ecclesiastical, although controlled in things civil by the other estates of the realm. She alone can convoke councils to confirm or alter articles of belief (Art. 21); by her solely can bishops be appointed (36); her priesthood can alone wash away original sin (27); and so spiritually omnipotent is her power, that all who receive her commission, *ipso facto*, are endued with the commission and authority of Jesus Christ, so absolutely, that their ministry is competent to regenerate and absolve, be they ever so infidel, so vicious, and even criminal (26). Nay, so absolute is her spiritual efficacy, that "that person which (3), by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church and *excommunicated*, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen man and a publican" (33). And as the "conclusion of the whole matter," the law and the articles declare that "she should rule all the estates and degrees committed to her charge by God, whether they be ECCLESIASTICAL or temporal, and restrain with the *civil sword the stubborn*;" and she has but recently appointed Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, and inducted Mr. Gorham to Bampford Speke, in the face of the solemn declaration of some of her bishops, many of the clergy, and her own spiritual courts, that they are heretics and schismatics. That there may be no room left for quibbling on the term "ecclesiastical," the Westminster clergy, in their address to the Bishop of London, assume the power to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange *doctrines*, and assert that the "Queen's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor of this realm, as well IN ALL SPIRITUAL and ecclesiastical causes as in temporal."

The Church of Scotland is equally explicit. It, indeed, claims for Christ the sole headship of the Church; while it concedes to the Queen, to Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Episcopalians, or indeed to any man, woman, or child who has money enough to buy the right of presentation, the sole power of setting any minister they choose over the care of immortal souls. But these ministers, so appointed, must receive the faith, not "as it was once delivered to the prophets," but as it may be delivered to them by an Act of Parliament made by Catholics, Anglicans, Socinians, Baptists, Quakers, Infidels, and Atheists. Such is the authority from which they derive their faith. Once declared, the Assembly has power (Confession of Faith, cap. 20) to suppress "erroneous opinions and practices" by "the power of the civil magistrate;" and "it is *his duty* (cap. 23, sec. 3) to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and *heresies be suppressed*."

Now, there is no accounting for tastes. Brother Jonathan considers that to be "a land of liberty where a man can larrup his *own nigger*;" and when Lapstone, administering the oil of strap to his spouse, was interrupted by a by-stander, the cobbler's wife clapperclawed her champion for daring to question the marital supremacy of her cobbler. But for my part, if I *am* to have a Pope, I should rather he sat at Rome than at Buckingham Palace or Edinburgh. If a spiritual autocrat is to domineer over our consciences, and dictate or proscribe our opinions, the further he is off the better. To my soul and immortal spirit, a queen, an archbishop, a moderator, or a justice of the peace, is as much "a foreign potentate" as a Pope; and I had much rather underlye the spiritual decrees of an impotent Italian priest, who is surrounded with no temporal power to execute them upon me, than those of a home-made

pontiff, who does not "bear the sword in vain," but who beggars me in spiritual courts, then casts me into prison, or seizes my tables and chairs to pay the costs of the paraphernalia of what the Prime Minister brands as "mummers and superstitions," and calls upon "the multitude of the faithful" to treat me as a "heathen man and a publican." Have the Methodists forgotten the ejection of their ministers by the Conference? Do the Presbyterians forget their exclusion from the Bible Society? or the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster from the Synod? or the Unitarians their being skinned of the Hewley endowments by the Baptists and Independents, on the very ground that no man in England should be suffered to hold property, be he Jew or Unitarian, who denied their doctrine of the Trinity? The word Protestant, in the mouths of the self-styled orthodox, is a living lie—and the Pope but honestly professes what he has no power to enforce, and that which his enemies daily and temporally practise.

Who will presume to plead that although in theory Protestant Churches constrain men's consciences, and claim the power to proscribe opinions, and suppress "heresies," as they style whatever diverges from their Paternoster, yet substantially, in Protestant countries, every religious opinion is tolerated? I have proved historically that this is utterly false. Paine, Hone, Hetherington, Southey, Byron, Carlile, were persecuted by the Attorney-General within living memory. Our common and statute law are full of pains and penalties for Dissent. It is *in spite of* Churches and Governments, in defiance, and against the frantic exertions, of parsons, ministers, and their creeds, that juries have snatched opinion from the fangs of bigotry; and does any man pretend that the Pope can in England do that which public spirit and national intelligence have been too strong to enable either the Government, the law, or the constitution to execute? In Catholic Germany religious opinion is as free as air; in Protestant England it is a slave on ticket of leave, clanking with iron at every motion of liberty. The very praise which episcopacy arrogates to itself is an insult to the subject. It calls itself a "tolerant Church." What right has Parson Surplice to talk of *tolerating me*? I thank him for nothing. "Religious toleration" is ecclesiastical impudence. I would as soon ask my scullion leave to live in my own house. I pay him, or he plunders me, to teach what I don't believe: and then he patronises his paymaster with the volunteer of his forbearance.

I am citizen of a State, as well as, I humbly trust, a loyal, though unworthy, subject of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible. I have, in these realms alone, seven millions, or a fourth of the whole people, as Roman Catholic freemen. They have rights of conscience, they have civil prerogatives. I have not forgotten the long account of cruelty, persecution, confiscation, banishment, and judicial or military murder, which all the kindness, and more than all the restitution we can render, would fail to cancel. But for Papists, where would Dissenters be now? Are we idiots as well as ingrates? It was the Catholic cause which redeemed opinion from the bondage of prelacy. The Irish members achieved for us the Reform Bill. It was Irish and Catholic majorities which, step by step, and inch by inch, against English Churchmen, obtained for us Municipal Reform, the repeal of Tests, the abolition of Negro slavery. O'Connell and his tail mustered for the people in every division to extend the franchise, to abolish monopolies, to emancipate trade, to untax bread, and untax butter. Dissent would now be lying prostrate before prelatic ascendancy, the rotten boroughs would be extant, the corporations and magistracy would be closed to nonconformity, the loaf would be little and dear to this hour, but for Catholic influence and Popish votes. But for these, Lord John Russell would not have represented London, and a Tory would have been Prime Minister. Show me a British Catholic, and I will show you a Liberal. Let me see a genuine prelatic Churchman, lay or clerical, and there you will find the champion of prerogative, the enemy of the common rights of British subjects, the apologist of slavery, the foe of freedom in trade, pen, and tongue. If "by their fruits ye shall know them," in which professor should you place reliance?

There was once a proclamation pasted upon the door of an episcopal cathedral, "There is a purpose of marriage betwixt the Church of England and the Church of Rome," and underneath was written, "I forbid the bans: the parties are within the forbidden degrees." What is there in Canterbury that is better than the Vatican? Wherein does the presbyter differ from the priest? Ground is consecrated, bread, wine, in England as in Italy. The eucharist is administered by the parson alone, and to single communicants only. It is not "elevated," indeed, in London as the Host is in Naples; but it is snugly conveyed in the rector's bag, with his churchrate-washed surplice, to the bed-side of the dying, and there the parting-spirit receives what in Britain is called the "Holy Communion," and in Italy goes by the convertible term of the "Vaticum," and that, too, in the face of the Article which forbids it to be "carried about."

If the doctrine of the "Real Presence" is heterodox, where is the harm of it? It is only, after all, a *literal* interpretation of the *very words* of the founder of the ordinance, "This is my body and blood." What right has a Protestant to judge what is metaphorical and what literal in Scripture? The Quakers are exempted from oath-taking by Act of Parliament because they *literally* obey the commandment to "swear not at all." The Baptists complain that we too literally interpret the practice of the Evangelists in christening infants. Sir Robert Harry Inglis insists upon retaining judicial strangulation, by literally rendering the declaration, "Whoso sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But, after all, in what does the consubstantiation of the Church of England differ from the transubstantiation of Rome? Both

declare virtually the "real presence" in the eucharist. "The bread which we break (Art. 28) is a partaking of *the body of Christ*; and likewise the cup of blessing is a *partaking of the blood of Christ*." "*The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten* in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" but it *is* given, and taken, and eaten, and is actually *there*, although only spiritually, at least so say the Thirty-nine Articles, and they *should* know, else it is high time we should get our money back again.

We should fain hope that such free and easy souls as officer what may now be fairly called the church *militant*, are not too much scandalised at the practice of auricular confession and priestly absolution. Perhaps they only act upon the principle of the butler, who, upon being taxed by his master with drinking his wine, answered, "Yes, I do; but I take care that nobody else does." In fact, they hold Popery too good a thing to be wasted, and would allow nobody to be Papists but themselves. "The sick person," says the Prayer Book, shall "be moved to make a special confession of his sins," and "the priest shall absolve him after this sort:—" "*I absolve thee from all thy sins*." "To the officers of the Church," says the Westminster Confession (Cap. 30, Section 2) "the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins." This is the faith of the Church of Scotland—the Free, Relief, Burgher, and Ulster Synods. It would seem that they each claim exclusively the Bramah key and Chubb lock of the treasury of salvation, and accuse all others of spiritual burglary, effected by the skeleton keys of heresy, the crowbar of superstition, or by picking the lock with "insolent and insidious" Popish Bulls. But they all equally deny that the door is open, and none of them will leave it ajar, if they can find queens or laws to help them to shut it. "Whosoever," says the Morning Prayer service of the English Church, "will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." "Adam," asserts the Confession, imparted his sin to us all, "descending by natural generation." (Cap. 6, Sections 2 and 3.) We are thereby "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." (Section 4.) "Without any foresight of faith or good works, or any other thing in the creature moving him thereunto" (Cap. 3, Section 5), God, of the "pleasure of his good-will," chose to predestine a few to "everlasting glory," "the rest he was pleased to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath, to the *praise of his glorious justice*." (Section 7.) "Men not professing the Christian religion," a category in which may be embraced ninety-nine out of every hundred of the human race, are to be damned eternally, "be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain" the contrary "is very pernicious and to be detested." (Cap. 10, Section 4.) In perfect consistency with these comfortable doctrines, Edwards avers that "there are infants in hell a span long," and that we "shall *roast* through an eternity yet." Boston declares that godly children will sing hallelujah at the burning of "the father that begot them, and the mother who bore them;" and Watts has set to music a hymn which assures the "rebel worm" that fiery billows will "beat upon his naked soul in one eternal storm." Lord Chancellor Bacon's definition of a Christian is, throughout, an antithesis of contradictions, and a logical contrast of mutually destructive paradoxes. And to such a pitch of blasphemous extravagance is Anglican orthodoxy carried, that Prior, the poet, explains how

"Almighty languished, and Eternal died,
And Earth profaned, yet blessed with Deicide;"

while the pious Dr. Samuel Johnson, in his dictionary, defines Deicide to be "the murder of God, the act of killing God. It is only used in speaking of the death of our blessed Saviour." Even Bishop Jeremy Taylor bids men console themselves for a "thin table," by the reflection that "the King of heaven and earth was fed with a little breast-milk."

Such is the State religion, such the Protestant faith of this country, which I, and you, and all of us must swear to maintain, if we would represent the people in Parliament, and must pay to propagate whether we are represented or not. I put it to your candour and your honesty (if parsons have left any to spare), can a believer in "Deicide" afford to scoff at the elevation of the host—can the professor of faith, in the feeding of the Almighty on "a little breast-milk," venture to ridicule "wafer Gods?" Is the disciple of *consubstantiation* entitled to persecute the abettor of *transubstantiation*? Is the Anglican priest to hear confession of sin, and to grant absolution, or the Presbyterian minister to have "power to retain and remit sins," and deny the privilege to the Cardinal? Is the Moderator of the General Assembly to have a monopoly of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and to refuse a duplicate to the successor of Saint Peter? In fine, is the elevation of the Host profane, and the carrying about the Eucharist in a carpet-bag sacred?—or shall the parson take the Holy Communion to the bedside of the dying churchman, and deny the *Fiatcum* to the expiring Papist?

Orthodoxy is *my* doxy, and heterodoxy is every other man's doxy. The intelligent faith of to-day is the grovelling superstition of to-morrow; and the time will come when the creed of the loudest denouncer of "mummies" will be regarded as too extravagant for the most crazy fanatic. Truth and God, indeed, never change; but man's knowledge of what *is* truth, and his conceptions of God, alter and enlarge with the progress of his powers. Bacon

believed in witchcraft; Socrates, ere he composed himself to death, sacrificed a cock to Esculapius; More was a Mariolator; Aristides the Just bent the pious knee to Olympos, and Cicero reasoned his way to the immortality of the soul, as he discoursed upon the nature of the heathen gods. The founder of the inductive philosophy believed "three to be one, and one to be three; a father not to be older than his son; a son to be equal with his father; and one proceeding from both to be equal to both—three persons to be in one nature, and two natures in one person; a virgin to be the mother of a son, and that very son of hers to be her maker; him to have been a weak child, carried in arms, who is Almighty; and him to have died who alone has life and immortality in himself." How shall he dare talk of mummeries who devoutly repeats the barbarous jargon of mutually destructive propositions contained in the farrago of Athanasius, or strain at the gnat of the Real Presence while he swallows the camel of that "eternal procession," which the pious Clarke called "eternal nonsense?" Is the Trinity of Hindostan even, an "old wife's fable," and the Trinity of Canterbury, which Luther said, "sounds oddly, and is a human invention," and Calvin pronounces "barbarous, insipid, profane, a human invention, grounded on no testimony of God's word—the Popish God, unknown to Jesus Christ and the Apostles," alone worthy of respectful acceptance? Who is to be the judge of the line which separates a mystery from superstition, or why should the voracious appetite of the believer, who bolts whole the contradictory genealogies of Matthew and Luke, and digests the doubtful canons of the first two chapters of these gospels, with the miraculous conception, and the notorious forgery of 1st John 5th and 7th, contract his gullet when men eke out from the Fathers doctrines which, more honestly and candidly than their censors, they confess their inability to derive from the canonical Scriptures? What separates the Apocrypha from the Bible but the thin partition of the mere groping labours of unstable word-mongers, guided only by self-created canons of criticism? What made the Book of Revelations a part of the received text, but a majority of one at the Babel Council of Trent?

I am no Roman Catholic, although I trust I am a Christian. But if my only alternative is to choose among contending creeds, I frankly own that I prefer the comfortable soul-repose which is to be found in the bosom of an infallible Church, to the Mahometan fatalism of Calvin, or the perplexing uncertainties and contradictions of Anglican theology. I am not surprised that the devout soul flies from the Presbyterian Thor or Odin who roasts infants a span long "to the praise of his glorious justice," to pine for rest in the arms of a priesthood who, with quite as probable a warrant, promise to absolve him from sin, and baptise his babes into salvation. I would far sooner believe that the prayers of just men, which avail much, and the intercessions of a living and human hierarchy, can beg my soul off from destruction, or beseech the spirits of even the worst of departed sinners out of hell, than in an inexorable predestinator, who, out of mere caprice, and without any reference to faith, good works, or "anything in the creature moving him thereunto," ordains a few to everlasting glory—but whom nobody can conjecture, because no sign of virtue or devotion will indicate—and *pleases* to pass by the rest of mankind, and to destine them to dishonour and wrath, for sins which, by natural generation, he has compelled them to commit. "Sooner," said Channing, "would I believe in gods who fell in love with the subjects of their own beautiful creation, than in an inexorable tyrant who sentences men to continual torments for sins which he has formed them with an utter inability to avoid." Were I to predicate the social and moral results which the contending systems are calculated to produce, what sane man would hesitate to prefer even mummeries and superstitions, an infallible interpreter and a tyrant hierarchy, who, and which, would lead the world to believe that, by piety, prayer, penance, and priestly absolution, all would be well with them, to a creed which proclaims to all that the utmost endeavours of mankind to frame their lives according to the light of natural conscience, and to the religion they profess, would not save them from eternal torments, and which emphatically assures every human being that neither faith, works, the strictest virtue, nor the purest piety, goodness, and truth, would in the least determine their everlasting fate; that they are not even permitted to be moral or religious; that they are forced to sin by descent, which they could not help, from Adam, whom they could not preserve from evil; and that the divinest or the most criminal life are equally indifferent to a God who settles our destiny according to no principle of desert or virtue. It is this demoniacal system which drives many to Bedlam, more to Rome, most of all to the "Everlasting No," and which only does not lead the despairing victim of a gloomy superstition to vice, as being indistinguishable in its results from a course of virtue, simply because the prominent doctrines of the Church are neither taught by those who are sworn to teach them, nor practically believed in detail by those who profess them in the lump. It is Calvin and Luther, London and Exeter, who recruit the army of Pio Nono. Burns believed that even the Devil will be saved—Peter offers salvation to the worst; it was reserved for Jack and Martin to assert that even Plato would be damned—for Athanasius to consign Milton, Locke, and Newton to an anti-trinitarian pandemonium, and for the Anglican and Scotch Churches to send Pascal and Fenelon to keep them company.

When Wiseman offers you Pio, you answer, "No—no!" A creed is a Pope, and you have endowed two of them. If the Queen has spiritual supremacy *she* is a Pope. I have never heard that the Catholics own Pope Joan. Exeter and London, York and Canterbury, Jabez Bunting, a Moderator, a Conference, or a Conclave, are but different names for the same

tyranny. "Of all horses," says Carlyle, "your worst is a dead horse." A living Pope may change his interpretation of the Scriptures as criticism improves, learning enlarges, archaeological theology discovers. But the three hundred pretenders to infallibility who, two hundred and seven years ago, took the Bible from us, declared it to be no longer the religion of Protestants, digested their authoritative interpretation into the jargon of the Westminster Confession and Thirty-Nine Articles, put it into an Act of Parliament, endowed it with the whole wealth which they had plundered from the poor and the priests, and declared that that should be the religion of the free people of England and Scotland, *secula in seculorum*, were *dead Popes*, to whom the age can make no appeal, and from whom common sense can get no redress. The world has outlived, and out-thought, and out-informed them, as it has done Rome and its Vicar, but in vain. Intelligent Churchmen, even bishops and clergy, have declared that they do not believe, although they subscribe, these jumbles. Tillotson wished the world well rid of the Athanasian Creed, and Parr would never repeat it. But there still stand the immutable Bulls of the British Vatican, tossing and going all, and still worshipped as abjectly as the Bull of Phalaris. The Pope pretends to do no more than to *interpret* Scripture; he claims no right to *make* it. If men reject his digest of it, he alleges that they deny the Scripture. What more and what less does every creed-maker? It is in vain that the Unitarian appeals to Scripture from the doctrine of the Trinity; the Book of Common Prayer tells him that without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. In vain does the Universalist point to the evangelical proclamation of the inexhaustible benevolence and the impartial paternity of the Almighty. The Calvinist, like the Pope, assures him that it is not in *his* face that he flies, but in that of Divine truth, in denying the exclusive salvation of the elect, and the eternal torments of the whole of the rest of mankind. Should the Arminian, like the Apostle, inquire, "If any man saith he hath faith, can faith save him? Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works"—he shall be answered by the Predestinarian, that no foresight of faith or good works, or anything in the creature, shall avert the sentence of the Divine executioner; and that to differ with the creed-monger is to dissent from the Bible. If Gorham, or Campbell of Row, if Hampden, or Shore, propose to "open the Scriptures, and reason from them daily, and search them to see if these things are so," the Assembly or Exeter tell them they talk beside the question; that the Confession and the Articles are the authoritative canons, and final interpreters of Divine truth, and that if he dissents from these he dissents from inspiration. These dead and buried—if we are to believe their disciples, we ought to add—and perhaps damned, infallibilities, sit like hideous spiritual nightmares on the consciences of living men, and crush the free breathings of the immortal soul with the Mesmer paralysis of their presumptuous and insolent absolutism of dictation.

Is it wonderful that the free spirit of progress and intelligence has rebelled against these scandalous machinations, for "making the Word of God of non-effect by your vain traditions?"—that we have at last arrived at that humiliating state of unfaithfulness and hypocrisy which sees a clergy subscribing creeds they do not teach, and a people professing a faith they do not believe?—that an archdeacon, and a professor of moral philosophy, should vaunt that "he could not afford to keep a conscience?"—and that the scrupulosities of common honesty are punished as the contumacities of recusancy? "I am not afraid, my lords," said the senator, "of men of scrupulous consciences; but I will tell you whom I am afraid of, and they are the men that believe everything, that subscribe everything, and that vote for everything." Verily the Church would keep him in a perpetual panic. Too truthfully did Lord Chatham, looking hard at the bench of bishops, declare that "we had got a Popish liturgy, an Arminian clergy, and a Calvinistic creed."

I am no Papist; my complaint is that there is no Protestantism. We anathematise claims to infallibility; we denounce spiritual supremacy; we fulminate our priestly thunders against persecutors and believers in the legitimate absolutism of the Pontiff; and, to prove our sincerity, we sedulously follow his example. "The villany he teaches us we will execute, and it shall go hard but we will better the instruction." A dissenting alderman from the bench "has no doubt that a little imprisonment would do the Cardinal good; but he understood he had already received notice to quit London in forty-eight hours!" The tyranny of Metternich and the police of Austria introduced into England, and a London citizen—the wish being father to the thought—hopes that Government will trample on the Constitution because a fellow-subject is a cardinal! A moral idiotism seems to seize the rabid Papophobist, and he would persecute to enforce toleration, and emancipate the conscience by measuring every man's corn by his own bushel, or setting himself up as the sole judge of the lawfulness of his neighbour's faith.

If I am to own the spiritual supremacy of any poor worm of the dust, frail and fallible like myself, let it be by some more decent title than a piece of parchment. "I will," said Lord Wharton, "respect a Parliamentary king, and cheerfully pay all Parliamentary taxes; but I will have nothing to do with a Parliamentary religion, nor will I worship a Parliamentary god." The Pope is at least set apart to the ministry from his early youth, and segregated for life to religious studies and pious offices. He has "received the Holy Ghost," the imposition of hands, if it be an imposition, and by ecclesiastical transmission, *such as it is*. He is in regular orders, and is elective by a legitimate clerical convocation. The proprieties of a

spiritual call respect the consciences of the devout; and the solemnities of choice, do reverence to the piety of the faithful. Roman Catholics at least respect themselves by enforcing the decencies of hierarchical order, and do no outrage to sincerity in the logic of their ecclesiastical economy, if they offend the colder severity of a costive faith. But what must be the hypocrisy or shamelessness of that moral obtundity which could look upon George IV., drunk in the midst of his harem, as his spiritual sovereign—which could contemplate with complacency the advent to the pontifical throne of Saint James's of the late Duke of York, who was also Bishop of Osnaburg—or which could claim, as the interpreter of his faith, or the dictator of his theological conscience, the "Sailor King?" The Dalai-lama is a boy caught by priests, imprisoned, and worshipped, as the easiest instrument of sacerdotal imposture. We call to our throne, without election or other qualification than that of hereditary descent, a princess of eighteen, and thrust upon her the attributes of spiritual supremacy!—and now we make the power we ourselves create the pretext for denying the right of others to make a better choice, who only do greater homage to religion, and display a livelier sensitiveness of devotion, by refusing to prostitute a sacred office to the exigencies of a political institution.

I deny the Queen's spiritual supremacy. I reject the Pope's; but he is a traitor to the rights of his fellow-subjects, and an enemy to the rights of conscience, who claims the privilege of owning the Queen as his pontiff, and refuses to others the liberty to claim ecclesiastical fealty to Pío Nono as his Pope. I will bow the knee of my soul's stature to no erring and fallible creature of the dust. In spirit I stand on an equality of nothingness before God, the Universal Father, who is no respecter of persons, and before whom monarchs are fain to hide their crowns and veil their faces, and will one day be glad to own a common kindred in a common paternity. I own no master but Him who long ago told us that the Gentiles exercised dominion over others, but so it should not be with us; but the chief among us should be our minister, and the greatest should be the servant of all. Victoria is the Queen of Scotland—ask the Scot if he owns her spiritual dominion? Who ever heard of a territorial supremacy of the spirit? Is the soul a subject of the parish—does it change its master as the body moves? Then a trip to Paris loses me my spirit's sovereign. Is the Church of England a merely territorial Church, confined in its prerogatives and the efficacy of its ministrations? If so, the Queen's ecclesiastical supremacy is geographically bounded by the Atlantic, the German Ocean, and the Baltic. Grant that—concede that it is only by right of the legal establishment of her spiritual supremacy in England that she has a title to complain of the interference of the Pope, and then it is demonstrable that she has committed the very act she denounces. She has appointed a bishop to Jerusalem without the consent either of the Jews or the Syrians. She ordains one to Madras, and another to Calcutta. Is the Church of England established by law in New Zealand, in Gibraltar, in Malta, in Corfu, in Australia, in Tasmania? Ask our fellow-subjects there if they admit our right to legalise, or if they have recognised, or will ever consent to establish, any Church whatever, as a state religion. The Queen, then, has no spiritual supremacy in our colonies, and yet she has ecclesiastically invaded a territory over which she has no more spiritual prerogative than the Pope, and has not only ordained, but paid out of the British Exchequer, salaries to bishops in every one of them. Is sauce for the goose sauce for the gander? or are we to live on, verifying the adage, that one man may steal a horse, while another may not look over the hedge?

Ireland has, without objection, been territorially divided into Catholic archiepiscopal and episcopal sees for centuries. Calvinism has partitioned Ulster into orthodox and remonstrant synods. Methodism has parcelled out the United Kingdom into districts, with a hierarchy of president, conference, superintendents, circuit and local preachers. Presbytery is the established religion of Scotland. Let the Free Kirk, the Relief, and the Burgher Synods, have their parishes, their presbyteries, and their parliaments. Prelacy was suppressed by law, and the suppression secured by the treaty of Union; yet the prelatists have, *ex proprio motu*, revived the whole of the suppressed sees, and have not been contented to take new titles, but to use the very names and styles of the ancient bishoprics, in the face of a State Church; and even in their official documents to call theirs the *Church of Scotland*, and to receive grants from the public treasury.

I pass by the *offensiveness* of the epithets, "insolent and insidious," which the Prime Minister has thought it not unbecoming his position to apply to an European Sovereign, and not unstatesmanlike to attach to the conduct of the spiritual head of seven millions of the Queen's subjects. I am even content to see only manly terseness in slipshod English, and to exclaim with honest Sancho, "God bless the giver! A gift horse should never be looked in the mouth." But the favourite term of "insidious," which is so popularly employed to characterise the recent conduct of the Pope, reminds me forcibly of the simple gentleman who, upon being called a liar, retorted, "What do you mean to insinuate?" and, when kicked down stairs, ventured to add, "I hope you mean nothing personal?" Insidious! Why, the "Apostolical Letter" was published to all the world; it is as explicit as a cat-o'-nine-tails, as downright as a ten ton hammer, as plain as the

Minister's letter is pleasant—and a great deal plainer. It claims no subjects, it asserts power over no territory, it assumes no titles of recognised sees, it carefully avoids mention either of Canterbury or York, Exeter or London. It calls the ecclesiastical division it declares "districts;" it assigns the entreaties of seven millions of the loyal subjects of the Queen as the sole moving cause of his own intervention; and the express object, avowed and transparent, of the whole movement, is to throw off the servitude of the English Catholics to Rome, and to confer upon them a perfectly national and independent hierarchy, absolute in its own authority, responsible only to its own convocations, and removable only and exclusively by its own national courts. Ifal the letter called Wiseman a moderator, and Ullathorne a superintendent, Church ministers would have been as mute as church mice. President or Presbyter, Synod or Assembly, come not betwixt the wind and Exeter's nobility. Russell, like *Croaker*, in the play, mistakes a love-letter for the anonymous threats of an eunuch, and has the sharp scent of the old lady who felt "a strong smell of thieves in the house." But to my nerves the Papal brief sounds exceedingly like the successful endeavour of a plain man to say exactly what he would be at; and if it fails in emulating the staid courtliness of phrase, and the prudent reserve of language, which Lord John Russell alone can reach, the Christian mildness of Mr. Miall's clerical prize-fighters, the ethereal charity of our orthodox platform pulpiteers, the refined taste of a Nolan or a Cumming, the dignified simplicity of Campbell's Mansion-house eloquence, or the chastened oratory of Binney, the Weigh-house prophet, we must just make allowance for the inferiority by the reflection that we cannot have a Protestant Pope. If heavy jokes were attempted by a Chief Justice about trying the Archbishop of Canterbury as a criminal, and promising him as fair a trial as if he were a thief, or by a pulpit-drummer about handing over the Primate of England to the police, and placing him in the dock, or by a clerical stentor in designating the Bishop of London "an old idiot," and his charge as "blasphemous nonsense"—they might run the risk of being mistaken for vulgar ruffianism. But the earth belongs to the saints, and *we* are the saints, and shall we not do what we like with our own?

What have the Protestants of the United States been about? Every county and every state has been parcelled out by the Pope into ecclesiastical sees, and by the Episcopalians into Anglican bishoprics, and yet orthodoxy actually sleeps quietly in its bed! It thinks if it can keep open its universities to all, while we shut ours against the majority, and shut its senate against priestly intrusion, while we send our bishops to rule Dissenters in the House of Lords, it can afford to laugh at the Pope and whisper to us, "Physician, heal thyself!" Nay, I am not without the misgiving that it may ask, "Is it a greater offence for the Pope than for the Queen's own subjects to pass her by, as the fountain of honour, and call themselves Bishop of Glasgow, or Moderator of the Free Kirk, or President of the Conference?" Call a Sovereign and a Pope "insolent and insidions" if you please, but beware how you insult a Binney, or scoff at a Bunting. You may swallow the Athanasian conundrum whole, but you must choke upon the riddle of the Real Presence; you may insert in your Bible the notorious forgery of 1 John, 5th and 7th, "teaching for doctrine the commandments of men," but you may not borrow help from the Fathers to elucidate the text, you may chain the souls of a people to the traditions of an Act of Parliament creed, or tie the nation's mind to the stake of the Westminster divines, but you must not quote Bellarmine, or pin your faith to Chrysostome. You may be daily committing that terrible, because anonymous and undiscovered, sin against the Holy Ghost, but the affrighted and frantic soul may not fly from the known terrors of unknown crime, or the consequences of the "ignorant sin" which has driven thousands to Bedlam, to the human comfort of a peace-speaking priest.

If the Pope is a clerical poacher, and a spiritual licence requires a Government stamp, what are we to say of the first Christian who commanded his hierarchy to "go forth and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, beginning first at Jerusalem," where the Temple was, and a God-ordained hierarchy already? What shall we say to Timothy, the Bishop of Troas, if we make mouths at Nicolas, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster? Paul minded neither Roman augurs, the proconsular denunciation of his *cautiabilis superstitione*, the wry faces of the priests of Jupiter on Mars Hill, nor the threats of the goldsmiths of Ephesus. Orthodoxy has a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; in what to a Mussulman does that differ from the Roman Propaganda? It has another for the Conversion of the Jews, and has adopted an "aggressive policy" in the Irish Missions.

The Spartans made their slaves drunk to teach their children sobriety. Perhaps rectors rail only to exhibit practically the ugliness of the vice of vituperation. They cry out against reason because reason cries out against them, and hug mystery as a convenient shelter from logic. Like the barber who refused to shave the coalheaver because "we must draw the line somewhere," they stop at a Trinity, and will not suffer Pedrillo to wish that Three were Four, in order to believe so much the more. They exclaim with the saint, "*Credo, quia impossibile;*" and assure the Papist that what is not

sense must be nonsense. Duke Hildebrod, Bishop of Alcatia, beat the Copper Captain in cursing, from his superior knowledge of theology. Dr. Cumming grudges Rome the advantage, and complains of the vehemence of her anathemas, probably because, as Genesis begins with a natural curse, and Revelations ends with a spiritual one, he considers that excommunication is a luxury in which the pious Erskine might indulge when he handed over his father to the devil from the paternal pulpit, and which may occasionally be granted to Protestants in the communion-service, but which ought not to be made too common by being hawked about by Papists, and should be reserved for British bishops and our native spiritual courts.

I rejoice to announce that "Lord John is amazingly popular in the city." That "noble letter" and his "most constitutional speech" have justly earned for him the patronage of Sir Peter Laurie, and his handsome offer to "put down" Popery. But is there not something ominous in the disappearance of Gog and Magog with the advent of a Cardinal? What will the braziers and tinnmen say of the zoological innovation of elephants, stags, and camels, upon the rights and privileges of civic chivalry, of the champion of England, and the man in armour? Protestants have dined down Popish Bulls at the Mansion House by their preference for ox beef—the soup-ladle has become the Defender of the Faith, and the carving-knife, like Hudibras' whinyard, which could quell heretics, scrape trenchers and clean shoes, is made the trusty "sword of the civil magistrate."

A spiritual Board of Health sits daily at the Hanover-square Rooms to rebuke the cholera of superstition by the chloride of Calvinism and the whitewash of prelacy. But—will "the steam keep up?" Parliament is a long way off. The platform ammunition of excitement may be expended in reviews when it should be reserved for the battle. Revenge sleeps, but never dies. Seven millions of Catholics, who are also Britons, will not, and ought not to be, insulted with impunity. Parsondom must stir the fire and blow the coal till its cheeks crack, else the orthodox conflagration may go out when it is most wanted, and the cold water of deliberation thrown upon it, may generate the steam of retaliation. Puseyism declines the partnership of universal Protestantism, and will have "all or none." Even the Bishop of London and Exeter declare the Pope's Bull to be an act of schism, which is a virtual acknowledgment of the prior identity of the authority of Rome and Canterbury. The discontented and the reviled will "bide their time;" and that time will show if the party of Reform is not to be sold to the faction of the Low Church.

I have now before me the "thirteen chief principles of the Jewish Faith," or, in other words, Baron Rothschild's creed. It is simple as truth. It believes that God is the Creator and sustainer of all—that he is One and alone—that he is a Spirit—that he is Eternal—that he is the only proper object of religious worship—that the Hebrew Prophets are true Prophets, of whom Moses was the chief—that the law given to him is that which is recorded in the Old Testament—that that law is immutable, like its author—that God is the searcher of hearts, rewards those who keep his commandments and punishes those who transgress them—that the Messiah will come—that there will be a last day, and "a resurrection of the dead, as a memorial for ever and ever. Amen." Dr. Cumming may buy this creed in Hebrew and English for a penny. I will make a present of my copy to the Bishop of Oxford for the asking. I will print it *in extenso* in my next edition, if it is desired.

Is there anything in that plain and wise creed which should incapacitate its professor from the offices of legislation? Compare it with the Confession of Faith, or the Thirty-nine Articles, and say, as an honest man, whether, as a secular, civil, political, and social guide, there is a word in it calculated to make its professor a bad subject, a bad neighbour, a bad ruler, or a profane worshipper? Is orthodoxy to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds? Is it to crush the spiritual liberty of Catholics because they profess to abet persecution, and persecute the Jews because they do not believe as it does? Here is the trial-test of the sincerity of the present clerical agitation. If they do not make men responsible to them for their belief, why do they deny civil rights to Israel? If they do make themselves lords of the conscience, what plea have they for becoming inquisitors upon Rome? The Jews keep "the faith once delivered to the prophets"—their prophets are ours—their commandments are written up in all our churches—our communion-service is purely Hebraic from beginning to end—three-fourths of our Prayer-book, and five-sixths of the Westminster Confession, including the whole moral and social law of Christians, are taken from the Old Testament. The commandments of Christ himself are quotations from the Pentateuch. Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one—thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself—what does God require of thee but to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before Him—thou shalt have no other Gods before me—his tender mercies are over all his works. Is there not here enough to banish superstition—to eschew mummeries—to fear God—to hope for immortality—to observe truth and justice—to make a good subject, a good citizen, a good neighbour, and a virtuous and pure-minded man? Then wherefore does the Church, whose chief osten-

sible cause of quarrel with Rome is its tendency to tyrannise over the conscience, refuse the common rights of citizenship to those who profess not one principle incompatible with the spiritual, mental, social, or political prerogatives of the citizens of a free country? They are persecuted by the Catholics—they are degraded and persecuted by the Protestants; and the Protestants denounce the Catholics for claiming spiritual ascendancy.

I ask the dissenters to wait and watch; I entreat all who are not the poor slaves of a creed or of a Church to pause, and try orthodoxy by its conduct to the Jews. I shall mark the doings of the Cabinet. If it be honest, it will checkmate the House of Incurables. No priest, no paternoster—no song, no supper—no act of Parliament to regulate hierarchical titles without a clause to emancipate the Jews. I have no objection to curtail to the humility of a more modest phraseology Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral. If he will copy the decent sobriety of the Pope's Apostolical Letter, he will cease to tell Englishmen, in the language of a Sovereign, "We govern, and shall continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex." But the Commons, I trust, will be firm. Rothschild must be raised to his rights if Wiseman is to be contracted to his proper dimensions. It must be on Protestant, not upon Church grounds, that titles and names of honour must be reserved to the dispensation of the chief magistrate. The uniform worldly policy and religious principles of the Hebrews are to be faithful in their civil allegiance to the Sovereign whose subjects they are, and neither to make nor meddle in the polemics or theology of other sects. Exeter triumphs if the Jews are not emancipated. London is suffered to punish for schism from his Church, not for the promotion of Protestantism, if legislation reaches Wiseman, and the choice of the citizens of London is ignored by Oxford, because he does not stomach their member's creed.

Parliament approaches—I will be at my post, as sure as my name is plain

Bow Bell, All Saint's Day.

JOHN BULL.

SPEECH OF THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF BRISTOL (DR. GILBERT ELLIOTT).

At a Meeting of Clergymen, held at Bristol, 6th November, 1850.

After some preliminary remarks, the Dean spoke as follows:—

The Pope has determined to place the Episcopate, which he had hitherto exercised in England through Vicars Apostolic, on the same footing in every sense (as I understand) with the Episcopate which at present exists amid the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

He has determined also to extend the Roman Episcopate in England. The Pope might have carried out his determination in a calm and unobtrusive manner, pleading the spiritual wants of those who adhere to his communion in England. If he had thus done, the act ought, nevertheless, to have arrested attention, and to have caused most anxious inquiry. The reason for the change and extension ought to have been considered; and if it were found true that Romanism had increased, and was increasing, only too much reason would have been given for the anxiety which has brought us here to-day, and for the impression that I presume we all entertain that a duty lies on us, in God's name and under God's grace, to stem and abate the evil.

But the Pope has thought fit to carry out his determination in no such quiet, or unobtrusive, or apologetic manner. He has proclaimed his determination in terms of unwonted boasting, arrogance, and contumely. He seems purposely so to have culled his phrase, as might enable him, with most daring, to challenge the supremacy which this nation has placed in the Crown, and to bid defiance to the injunctions of its laws. He contents himself not with rule over those who voluntarily submit to him, but, as the delegate of God, claims dominion over every baptised soul within this realm. He comes among us, not as only tolerated amid a national Church, but upbraiding us as faithless to God, and branding us as heretics and outcasts.

It would be more than strange if this utterly foolish, and presumptuous, and taunting conduct had not excited correspondent feelings, indignation and resistance.

Very undoubtedly, then, both the substance of the measure and its manner require separate consideration; and the latter as undoubtedly demands, and I trust will meet with, proper reprobation. But passions, when awakened, are apt to clamour down reason; and I much fear, that the passions awakened, and legitimately awakened, by this bold insult of the Pope of Rome, are leading us to forget what realities are couched under the measure itself.

I must beg some sufferance, and an absence of suspicion as to what I really mean, or as to what I shall eventually propose, while I deprecate the allowing our zeal to run away with our discretion. It is the greatest possible consequence to our cause, to our standing well with the people, and to our ultimate success, that we are not hurried away into exaggeration—into the assertion of things which may easily be contradicted, and into complaint and fears which will eventually only excite ridicule. I allude to such statements as I have seen attributed to eminent authorities in the Church, implying that our orders *have been* invalidated; that the

two most ancient provinces of the western Church, those of Canterbury and York, *have been* annihilated; and that the *Jus commune* of Papal Rome *has been* substituted for the constitutions and canons of the Anglian Church. Let us feel very contentedly aware that the Pope can neither confirm nor invalidate our orders, nor any other orders than those of his own communion; and let us feel perfectly persuaded that our two most reverend Primates have not less sure and comfortable possession of the rights and revenues of their provinces at this moment than they have had hitherto. And let us not for a moment believe that the Pope can secure to himself, or to any delegates of his, so much as one atom of jurisdiction in England, no, not even over the most abject slave to his superstition. Nor let us trouble ourselves to show, as some take great pains to do, that the Pope has no claim to dominion in this realm, because of some independence of the Church of England prior to the Pope's usurpation of supremacy here, through Augustine or through the Norman princes. Let us be very well content to know, that if this Priest of Italy had had dominion over us up to this very hour, it would have been quite enough cause and excuse to us, that he should cease to have it, simply in our choosing no longer to submit to it. Let those grovel who will in this unworthy inquiry, let us rather learn to know what is Christian liberty, and to thank God that we have it.

Nor let us rail against "the schism" of the Pope's measure, and talk of its being "a fundamental principle of the universal Church, that there can be but one bishop in a diocese." So doing, we condemn our own Church, who, at the Reformation, sent Bishops to Ireland, in my opinion then Catholic—and since to Canada and to our colonies, to Malta and to Jerusalem; we condemn the Bishop of London, who does not scruple to confirm when he is in France, and to license a clergyman in a Roman diocese at Madeira; we condemn the Episcopal Church of Scotland, who sent a Bishop to reside at Paris; we condemn ourselves, who, I presume, without scruple, would use the ministrations of a Protestant Bishop if we happened to sojourn in a Catholic diocese.

Nor let us be hurried into urging that there shall be some paction between our Crown and the Pope as to the appointment of Roman Bishops. Such a measure is one which Catholic princes, who acknowledge the Pope's supremacy, are obliged to take for their own security. But a concordat in our case would only be to recognise and give a position to the Catholics here, making a distinction between them and other dissenters.

And above all, let us not meet the question, as it seems to be met with in some quarters, as though it were a struggle between Rome and some imaginary Church of England for the right and title of being delegated by God to have exclusive dominion over the minds of men here in England. In some quarters there seems to be a fretfulness and indignation, as though occasioned by the assumption of some intrusive party of the right to dictate and control, which they wish to keep to themselves. They appear to resent the intrusion of Roman Papacy, only because it interferes with their own Anglo-Papacy. It seems to be, with these, a struggle for power, not for truth. From such temper, arising from such thoughts, let us diligently keep ourselves.

Yet the manner of the Pope's measure must not be overlooked. There is a language of assumption here which, empty as it may be in fact, is meant, and is calculated, to have its weight and effect. Falling Rome needed some *éclat*, some clap-trap, to sustain the failing hearts of some of its adherents, and to quicken the waning sympathies of others. Its disgrace in Italy was to be redeemed in the proudest, and freest, and most powerful of nations. It has courted struggle with England. Let it have it. Let us not be backward to meet the encounter. And I would suggest as a first step, that an address should be prepared to the Queen, to emanate, as I trust it may, not from a small knot of the clergy, but from a meeting of a more public nature. And I would suggest that that address should convey to the Queen, first, our regret that any foreign potentate should appear to lay claim to a supremacy which is vested in the Crown, and to a jurisdiction in direct contravention to our law; next, our very humble but urgent request that her Majesty should withdraw those marks of favour and of confidence which she had been pleased so graciously to confer on the prelates of a Church, both in Ireland and in the colonies, who gave her no other return than ingratitude and indignity; and lastly, a renewed declaration of our perfectly unreserved attribution to the Crown of "supremacy in all causes, &c.;" adding, that we feel ourselves impelled to that declaration, because of the denial of that supremacy by some who, having made the declaration at their ordination, think fit now to modify it, and yet to retain their dignities and benefices.

I would further suggest that we adopt partially the advice of the Bishop of London, and petition Parliament to the effect that, if the law be not already such as shall prevent any person or persons whatever from claiming jurisdiction in the British dominions, or delegating an authority independent of the Crown or superior to the law, or conferring titles of honour or designations which seem meant to convey independent authority, a law shall be forthwith passed which shall secure such result.

But, above all, let us look to the substance of the Pope's measure, irrespective of its manner. Assuming it to be unobjectionable that he should provide Bishops for those of his communion in England, and that he does provide them in the most unobjectionable manner, it behoves us to ascertain what are the grounds which have moved him thus to do? We are neither left to imagination, nor to suspicion, nor to our own observations, nor to our own conclusions. The

Pope gives his motives. He states it as a fact, and I doubt not that it is a fact, that the Roman communion of England has much increased, and that there is every reason to expect greater increase. Then exactly as we accept this statement of the Pope as true, and exactly as we think ill of Romanism, and regret its increase and would withstand its influence, so exactly are we bound to consider what be the cause of this past success, and this sanguinely expected increase. Is, then, this past and present success and increase due to pure Roman aggression? does it arise from any action of its own, out of its own proper force and vigour?

I have not heard of any new and great polemic having arisen among them, convincing the world, either by speech or by books. I have neither seen nor heard of direct antagonism in public debate or controversy between Roman and Protestant opinion. The Papists themselves seem to admit that all this unwonted success, astonishing themselves, and all their new-born hopes, are attributable to the existence and to the working of Tractarianism. It does not need that the Papist should address himself to, or enter into discussion with, the confirmed Protestant. They allege freely, they have never concealed, that Tractarianism is doing their work. It is when Tractarianism has unsettled the Protestant that the Romanists step in. They haunt Tractarian congregations; they track and note those unto whom they think they may most safely address themselves; they arrange the meeting with them, as though it were casual; they convey letters to them—I speak of what I know; their argument is, that the Church of England does not, with any certainty, teach or offer what the Tractarian minister tells them, and as they admit, rightly tells them, is necessary either to a saving faith or to spiritual life, but that the Church of Rome does; and so they ply and gain their victims.

Then if we think it time and our duty to oppose Rome, how better oppose it than by opposing that which takes of our people and hands them over to Rome? *Remember it is not from dissent that Rome gains its victims, it is principally from the Church of England; and it is from the Church of England simply because its authorities, and not itself, recognise and countenance a teaching which is either identical with that of Rome, or so close to it as to find its more perfect consummation in that communion.*

But how best oppose Tractarianism? How best not only show its identity with Roman falsehood, and its most plain contrariety with the history, the formularies, the temper, the aim of the Church of England? How best remove it from contact with our unsuspecting people? The Bishop of London desires us, in this crisis, to preach controversial sermons; I presume his lordship means against the Romanists, and not the Tractarians.

But what if we preached controversial sermons all our lives long, and every day of our lives, either against Romanism or Tractarianism, what effect would this have if our authorities countenanced, shielded, promoted, or were by law unable to rebuke the Tractarians? Tractarianism will never be effectually checked—Tractarianism will only smile, or deride our every effort, until the authorities of the Church can be induced to perceive and acknowledge the utter repugnance between Tractarianism and the teaching of our Church, and the teaching of the Saviour and his Apostles.

I think it, then, very plain indeed that our Bishops should separately be memorialised by the laity and clergy of their several dioceses. But I do not think it should be an address for advice, but a memorial rather conveying advice and urgent entreaty that the Bishops should use whatever powers the law has intrusted to them, or the influence of their position may acquire for them, to remove if possible, to restrain at least, to discountenance at least, Tractarian teaching and practices. It would be invidious, and perhaps impossible, that any body of the clergy only should thus address the Diocesan, and for that reason, but not for that reason only, would I suggest that such an address should emanate from a mixed meeting. Far too long and too much it has been the effort of one part of the clergy to make a distinction, and so cause division, between the clergy and laity. We cannot too soon connect ourselves with the laity in all common councils, and more especially connect the laity with the Bishops in kind, equal, and unreserved communication in all that concerns the interests of the Church and of religion. I have said quite enough to show why I do not coincide with the memorial which has already been addressed to the Bishop. But I would fain say a very few words more. That memorial not only omits what I think perfectly essential, and that is a reference to Tractarianism within our Church as the principal and criminal cause of the increase of the Roman apostacy among us, but it countenances (I am sure unconsciously on the part of some who have signed it) the very error which fatally links Tractarianism with Romanism, and is the source of all their analogous contradiction to gospel simplicity and gospel truth. And if I be asked what be this same fundamental error, from which flows necessarily the like contradictions to God's gospel, I answer, the doctrine that God has by sacrament, by sacramental orders, set apart a body of men unto whom He commits the carrying out the offices of that priesthood of Christ which St. Paul calls intransmissible, and whom he makes the authoritative interpreters of his word, the prescribed and exclusive channels of his grace, and so the imparters of salvation unto men. Hence, with Rome, the Tractarians claim for the clergy that they are in the highest sense the Church of Christ; hence, with Rome, they scruple not to adulterate the word of God with tradition, and demand submission to their dogmas; hence they hold that as they be the priests, the agents of God, that confession to them is necessary, as if otherwise God would not hear it, that absolution by them is necessary,

as if God could not otherwise pardon. Hence, with Rome, they insist that with them it lies to bring down our Saviour, in substance, in material presence to mingle with the eucharistic elements; hence their doctrine that it is not on the grace of God, secured by Christ's passion, that we then feed, but on Christ materially; and that to this end, that so we might incorporate Him carnally with ourselves, was His incarnation. Hence all their doctrines of the sacraments carrying grace solely in their administration and reception; hence their doctrine of an inherent righteousness in baptism, of justification by something else than faith; hence their doctrine of purgatory (for this, in fact, if not in word, many Tractarians hold); hence their doctrine of communion for the dead, and the dead receiving refreshment from the priest offering sacrifice in their behalf; hence their notion, with Rome, that it is enough if the priest transact the service of worship in the name and stead of those who only need to give their personal attendance; hence their indifference that their services be conducted in a way "not understood of the people;" hence the impious pride which distinguishes between the laity and the priest; hence the setting apart of the chancel, and the presence there of the Clergy only, because they are "more holy than others."

And yet this very error of a priesthood, to stand between man and God, and to control the office and work of His Holy Spirit, this very error that God has instituted a visible hierarchy, set apart arbitrarily to govern and direct those baptised unto Him, I fear may, by a Tractarian, be said to lurk in one phrase of that memorial. I am most perfectly aware that some who have signed that memorial and have done much true service in the Church of God, would rather have suffered their hand to have been burnt off than to have affixed their signature consciously to any thing which might, by any ingenuity, be wrested to the recognition of any such doctrine; but yet, I verily believe that position will be said to have been meant, to have been conveyed, and to be guarded in the phrase which speaks of "the schismatical intrusion upon the Bishop's rightful authority in the Church of Christ." I trust I may not appear presumptuous, and I would not be thought to blame, but I must confess that as yet the only result that I have been able to see of the haste of the Protestants to meet what they call the emergency of this crisis, has been to strengthen the Tractarians. It seems to be agreed that no direct allusions should be made to them, that their errors should be overlooked, in order that they may be induced to commit themselves against Popery. Some concession is made to meet them, and that concession appears to me the acceptance of the very basis of all their error. Every artifice is made use of by the Tractarians and their friends to save this principle from condemnation, and even to obtain covertly its recognition. We condemn Popish doctrines in the lump, and they affirm they are ready to condemn Popish doctrines and practices also with us; only, in their own mind, they reserve much of what we call Popish, by calling it to themselves Catholic. We think we are carrying the Tractarians with us; in fact they are tricking us into support of them. To them, this demonstration, so long as it be carried on in heedless, angry haste, is matter purely of congratulation. It is as the tub thrown to the whale. By adhesion to the ambiguous declarations yet made they appear to coincide with us, and so disarm the long suspicion with which they have been watched, and obtain to themselves the freedom from observation so necessary to their unhallowed work.

The Bishop of London desires his clergy to preach against Rome; but what right has the Church of England to preach against Rome, if Tractarianism be consistent with the Church of England? What right have we to condemn, if it can be retorted with truth, if it can be affirmed, as it is vehemently affirmed, by clergymen professing to be dutiful members of the Church of England, that in all essential doctrines we are the same with the Church of Rome?

And how are we to grapple with Tractarian practices, which the Bishops are either unwilling or unable to forbid? How are we to deal with practices, with directions, with *new offices*, with suspected Romish customs, when the Tractarians use their utmost endeavours to conceal what they are, and the Bishops will not drag them into light? What hope have we to countervail this direct effort to lead to Rome, if the Bishops will not interfere with a hand which, when they please, can be made sufficiently heavy and strong?

Now let it be remembered, with burning shame before man and with deep sorrow and humiliation before God, that *it is from the Church of England that Popery has mainly derived the converts of which it boasts*. And let no one be so wilfully blind as not to see that this is so because the Church of England has not been willing, or has not had strength, to repudiate and cast from it the Tractarian leaven.

Is it not high time, then, that the Church should cease to be misrepresented and betrayed? Is it not high time that the Tractarian treason should no longer be permitted to train converts to Rome, that Tractarian presumption should no longer ride rough-shod over the really faithful and mourning servants of the Church? Are we to forget who taught us that it is better to pluck out a right eye, or cut off a right hand, than that the whole body should perish? Surely the Reformation was meant to be something real. Surely it was not for what they deemed a shadow that our martyrs laid down their lives. Why came they out of Rome, and called her Babylon, and her throne that of Antichrist, and built up another Church, if they did not mean that Church to be a witness against Rome, and to draw men out of the road which was in darkness and which led to destruction, unto that which led to the glorious liberty of the children of God, and unto consolations here, and salvation here-

after? Surely we owe it to our country, and much more we owe it to our Saviour, that we should do something to preserve this Church to Him. We should fear, for the sake of worldly policy, to be found by Him neither hot nor cold. Surely we are not wrong, if we think it to be that God, in His most kind providence, has now opened up to us a great opportunity for vindicating the noble and beautiful Church which He has committed to our charge; for attracting again to us the too much abated confidence of our people; for evincing before him, by our fidelity and courage, that we can yet value it as the next great mercy and blessing to the unspeakable blessing of His revelation in Christ, that He gave to man the wonderful and glorious Reformation.

THE QUEEN AND THE POPE.

The following Address of the Catholics of England to her Majesty, from the pen of his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman—a fact which gives additional importance to it—has been lying at the various Catholic churches and chapels, with the view of obtaining signatures to it, to testify to the loyalty of the Catholics of England to “Her Majesty’s royal person, crown, and dignity:”—

“TO THE QUEEN’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“May it please your Majesty,—We, the undersigned subjects of your Majesty, residing in England, and professing the Roman Catholic religion, beg to approach your Majesty’s throne, there to express our sentiments of unimpaired and unalterable fidelity to your Majesty’s royal person, crown, and dignity.

“At a moment when attempts are being made to impeach our loyalty, we consider it a duty to give fresh utterance to these our feelings.

“During centuries of exclusion from the privileges of the constitution, and from the rights enjoyed by their fellow-subjects, the Catholics of England remained true to their allegiance to the Crown of this realm, and yielded to none in their readiness, at all times, to defend its rights and its prerogatives against every foe. And now that, under your Majesty’s wise rule, we enjoy equal participation with others in the benefits of the constitution, we are more than ever animated with the same sentiments of fidelity and attachment, and are equally ready to give proof, whenever occasion may present itself, of the sincerity of our loyal professions.

“The dearest of the privileges to which we have thus been admitted, by the wisdom of the British Legislature, is that of openly professing and practising the religion of our fathers, in communion with the See of Rome. Under its teaching we have learned, as a most sacred lesson, to give to Cæsar the things that are of Cæsar, as we give to God the things that are of God. In whatever, therefore, our Church has at any time done for establishing its regular system of government amongst its members in this island, we beg most fervently and most sincerely to assure your Majesty that the organisation granted to us is entirely ecclesiastical, and its authority purely spiritual. But it leaves untouched every tittle of your Majesty’s rights, authority, power, jurisdiction, and prerogative, as our Sovereign, and as Sovereign over these realms, and does not in the leastwise diminish or impair our profound reverence, our loyalty, fidelity, and attachment to your Majesty’s august person and throne; and we humbly assure your Majesty, that among your Majesty’s subjects there exists no class who more solemnly, more continually, or more fervently pray for the stability of your Majesty’s throne, for the preservation of your Majesty’s life, and for the prosperity of your Majesty’s empire, than the Catholics of England, in whose religion loyalty is a sacred duty, and obedience a Christian virtue.”

The *Fifth Series* will contain an elaborate analysis and review of Cardinal Wiseman’s “Appeal to the People of England,” and Leading Articles of *Times*, *Daily News*, *Morning Herald*, *Morning Chronicle*, and *Morning Post*.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S APPEAL

(ANALYSED AND REVIEWED),

AND THE

LEADING ARTICLES OF THE "TIMES," "DAILY NEWS,"
AND "MORNING POST."

An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People, on the subject of the Catholic Hierarchy. By CARDINAL WISEMAN. London: Richardson and Son. 1850. Pp. 32.

TO ENGLISHMEN, IRISHMEN, AND SCOTCHMEN.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN,—There are three ways in which the "Three Denominations," to use a polemical phrase now so much in fashion, may live together—for live together we must. We are triangularly married, politically, geographically, and socially. We may dwell together like other married folks, merely because we can't help ourselves, on scarcely speaking terms. We may adopt the cat-and-dog plan of partnership, scratching and snarling at the same hearth; or we may pass our days like loving spouses, each doing their part to make their common cheerful fire-side the abode of mutual security, comfort, confidence, and peace. Conciliation Hall recommends the first plan, the Prime Minister advises the second, and Cardinal Wiseman prefers the third, by precept and example. As dismemberment is better than civil war, I think of the two former alternatives, the first is the least dangerous. Divorce is preferable to strife. Better that snarling dogs should each hunt his own separate ground, than that they should be buckled in a leash to sit and bite, when they should be pursuing their common game. Better still, that, as our interests, origin, language, and history are the same, we should, "if it be possible, as much as in us lies, live at peace with all men."

The Prime Minister has wounded the self-respect, the feelings, and the faith of one-third of the Queen's subjects, and by far the largest single religious denomination in the empire. The Lord High Chancellor, in his Mansion House (loving) cups, volunteered his hollow offering of affected bigotry to fat-cared ignorance and "wholesome" civic prejudice. And the Lord Chief Justice (if we are to credit the *Times* report), with a jaunty Jefferies jocularity, the good feeling of a Scroggs, and the praiseworthy earnestness of an Oates, suggested that he might have to try as criminals a Sovereign in Europe, and the ecclesiastical chief of the most populous sect in the Empire. It but required the resurrection of that zealous anti-papist, Dennis the hangman, with the Protestant Manual in the one hand, and the halter in the other, to have rendered the judicial establishment complete. I trust Sir Peter Laurie will not lose a moment in looking up Calcraft's principles, and putting him down, if he has wandered from the faith of his predecessor. Let him hint that we must have no boggling about *knotty points*—that we must *draw the line somewhere*—that we cannot *drop the subject*, or give him *rope enough*. He that is not for us, is against us; and in these ticklish times we must not only have staunch judges, but consistent and faithful finishers of the law, as in the good old George Gordon times, when George the Third was King.

I must put the question to myself and to you, What is all this to end in? Are we to go back to persecution, or onward to the full measure of religious liberty? Are we to emancipate the Jews, or re-enslave the Catholics? It is one thing to keep from a man that which he never had, and another to take back what we have given. While the people inherited the curse of the Corn-laws it was practicable to tax their bread. The ports are now open: let me see the man or Minister who will dare to shut them. There are eight millions of Roman Catholics in these our islands, of our own flesh and blood, embued with our own free spirit, British in heart, in thought, in love of liberty.

Fifth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution. [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row;

Of whom may be had "The Roman Catholic Question," Nos. I. to IV., price 1d. each.

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

We may outvote those who have so often helped us to outvote our enemies. We may carry Acts of Parliament by storm, to dishonour the Fathers of their faith, to outrage their feelings, and do violence to their deepest and most sensitive convictions. But a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. We cannot afford to part with the sympathies, the nationality, the loyalty, the cordial union of a third of our own numbers, even if the rest were all heartily combined against them, and there never had been a 10th of April in our annals. Of all sources of civil distraction, religious strife is the bitterest. Since ministers of religion have become demagogues and incendiaries, it is time that you and I, fellow-subjects and fellow-citizens, interested in the peace of our hearths, the happiness of our homes, the neighbourly communion of mutual kind offices, and the strength and glory of our country, which disunion would imperil, and distraction destroy, should come to a perfect understanding of our interests and our rights, and

"Leave all meaner things
To low ambition, and the pride of kings."

We must be statesmen, when statesmen become alarmists. We must think for the nation, when our natural guides hatch anarchy in the closet, and bring forth tumult in the press. The people of these realms must stand by each other and their own order, when the depositaries of our institutions, the trustees of the powers of faith and opinion, conspire to invoke the spirit of discord among the Commons, to beat the pulpit drum ecclesiastic to the *generale* of violence, and to trade in popularity upon prejudices which should be forgotten, ignorance of which we should be ashamed, and ancient grudges which wise men would hide, and prudent men would bury. Thieves get up street mobs, that in the confusion of the scramble they may have room to ply their trade. We can only save our pockets from being picked of our liberties, by keeping out of the crowd until the streets are cleared. Leave parsons and prelatists their platforms, parish meetings, and petitions. "Rubbing the poor itch of their opinion," the operation of "claw me claw thee" is the natural compact of the infected. Curates address bishops, and bishops graciously reply. Chapters read memorials to deans, that deans suspected of Puseyism may have the advantage of a public recantation. A pander press prints the gentle dulness; and because the columns of the journals are full of fudge, men bamboozle each other into the belief that the whole nation is at their back. Let these gentlemen alone. They can get on, or at least *seem* to get on, very well without us. If peaceable scot-and-lot citizens will but keep the house, the rioters will be marked, and the riot will cease.

I have read Cardinal Wiseman's appeal to you, to myself, to all of us. If it has beguiled some of their tears, you yourselves shall judge whether they were drops of weakness, or the dew which sometimes wells out of the justice of the English heart. It has flushed the cheek as well as moistened it—for it has given Protestants cause to blush for Protestantism. But here, like a garrulous host, I linger on the threshold, when the guest would enter and seat himself at the feast. Bear with me, for I am an editor, and, like other commentators, I am given to bury the text in my notes.

The appeal commences with an

INTRODUCTION,

which gives a brief history of the hierarchical state of the British Roman Catholic Church from the early period of its persecution in 1623, until 1850. It shows that so long as it was illegal to have a regular hierarchy, the Church was ruled by vicars apostolic, directly the nominees and servants of the Papal see; that the people desired and frequently beseeched the Vatican to grant them an independent and national hierarchy, so that they might be removed from foreign influences and command the administration of their own ecclesiastical economy; that so far was the Pope from desiring to adopt the step which is now so fiercely denounced and grossly misrepresented, that public State documents record the repeated refusal of the Court of Rome to comply with the reiterated and urgent entreaties of the British Catholics to do that which has now been rather wrung from, than suggested by, the supreme Pontiff; and that if there is any impropriety in the act, the Queen has to settle her account, not with the Vatican, which reluctantly conceded, but with eight millions of her Majesty's own subjects, who demanded, and are no doubt prepared to maintain, their lawful rights.

"Such was the main and solid ground on which the hierarchy was humbly solicited by Catholics from the Holy See. It was one that referred to their own internal organisation exclusively. Thoughts of aggression never entered the heads of the petitioners or the petitioned; nor were the bishops moved by *stupid ideas of rivalry with the Established Church, in what forms its weakness, nor any absurd defiance of national prejudices*. They knew that they violated no law in asking for what was needful for their religious existence, and they acted on an acknowledged right of liberty of conscience.

"Other motives were added, to show the expediency of granting this boon to the English Catholics; as, for example, that it had been granted to Australia, and was about to be granted to other colonies, without complaint from any one; and it looked like a reproach to the mother country to withhold from it what had been granted to its daughters.

"All this time there was no concealment, no attempt to take people by surprise. All Catholics knew of the intended measure; the papers announced it; so notorious was it, that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster petitioned Parliament against it; and a friend of the writer's heard the Dean of Westminster say, most openly, 'Well, he may call himself what he pleases, but at least he can never be Dean of Westminster?'"

Bravo, Dean! When the clerk told the rector that the flock were leaving the church, and going over the hill to the Methodist chapel, he wisely retorted, "D'ye see any of the *tithe* going over the hill to the Methodist chapel?" Times are altered, and mankind have degenerated. The flock have now an awkward habit of carrying away the fleece on their back. In these days of economy and free-trade, the world begins to pay only for what it gets, and to buy not only the bread that perishes, but the bread of life, in the cheapest market. Unless the people can be stirred up to cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" what is to become of the goldsmiths? When the gamekeeper's wages depend upon finding game, it is time to look after the poachers. The

APPEAL

to which the foregoing is an abstract of the Introduction, opens with a vigorous sketch of the instrumentalities of the excitement which it is the object of the writer to allay. "Unparalleled" in the history of modern agitation, violent as a whirlwind, its fury rendered a claim to a hearing impossible. A pause ensued, only to brew the storm. The newspapers of all shades and every humour combined to crush, denounce, and execrate. "Nothing was refused, however unfounded, or however personal, even by papers whose ordinary tone is courteous—or at least well-bred." "Every invocable agency, from the Attorney-General to Guy Fawkes, from a *præmunire* to a hustling, was summoned forth to aid the cry, and administer the vengeance of those who raised it."

"There soon sprung up from amidst the first confusion, a clearer and more natural agent, interested in promoting it." The Established Church looks upon the new constitution as a rival existence, "and it is but natural that its clergy should keep up an excitement which bears the appearance of attachment to themselves." (Really, this is too bad!) By degrees the agitation has subsided into a "*mere clerical and parochial movement.*" (Worse and worse!)

"At the present crisis, the Catholics of England had no right to expect any co-operation from the Government of the country—they asked for none; but they had the right of every citizen to impartiality. They naturally might have expected that *he to whom was entrusted the helm of the State would keep himself above those influences of party-feeling which disqualify the mind for grave and generous counsels; would preserve himself uncommitted by any hasty or unofficial expression of opinion; would remain on the neutral ground of his public responsibility, to check excess on every side, and moderate dangerous tendencies in any party.* Instead of this, the head of her Majesty's Government has astonished, not this country alone, but all Europe, by a letter which leaves us but little hope that any appeal to the high authority which rules over the empire would be received, to say the least, with favour.

"But another and a still graver power in the State has allowed itself to be swayed, by the passing blast, from the upright and inflexible position which Englishmen have ever considered natural to it: been accustomed to feel sure that the fountains of justice would retain their surface calm and untroubled, and their waters cool and pure. But on the present occasion the storm has been strong enough to disturb the very spring of equity. Instead of waiting till, from the woolsack or the bench, he might have been called upon to speak with impartial solemnity on what may be thought a momentous question, the Lord High Chancellor has preferred to deliver his award against us from behind the tables of a Mansion-house banquet, and to elicit the anti-Popish cheers of his civic companions [*Is this to be borne?*], rather than the honoured approbation of the peerage of the bar. His compeer in high judicial duties sat by and listened; was indignant, and justly censured; should he survive to be his biographer, let him, for the honour of *More's crime*, suppress the undignified and un-English phrases which he heard; for no one here, however raised up, has a right to talk of placing his heel upon even the covering of another's head, who, however humble, is as much a British subject and a freeman as himself, and claims equal protection from, as he pays equal deference to, the law of his country.

"While thus the avenues to public justice seem closed against us; while the press has condemned and raised our death-whoop, in spite of proffered explanations, deaf to every call for a fair hearing; while we may consider that the door of the Treasury may be barred against us, if we knock to ask, not for pensions or funds [It is of no use for Papists to look to Downing-street for drops of fatness, which are only to be found in the paths of waiters upon Protestant Providence], but for a reasonable hearing; when the very highest judicial authority has pre-judged and cut off all appeal from us; what resources have we yet left? what hope of justice? One in which, after God's unfailing Providence, we place unbounded confidence. There still remain the manly sense and honest heart of a generous people; that love of honourable dealing and fair play which, in joke or in earnest, is equally the instinct of an Englishman; that hatred of all mean advantage taken, of all base tricks and paltry clap-traps and party cries employed to hunt down even a rival or a foe. [*Is fair play, then, to be granted even to 'the Pope, the Devil, and the Pretender?* I trow not.]

"To this open-fronted and warm-hearted tribunal I make my appeal, and claim, on behalf of myself and fellow Catholics, a fair, free, and impartial hearing. Fellow-subjects, Englishmen, be you, at least, just and equitable! You have been deceived—you have been misled, both as to facts and as to intentions. I will be plain and simple, but straightforward and bold. I will be brief also, as far as I can, but as explicit as may be necessary.

"I begin, therefore, at once, with—

"Section 1.—*The Royal Supremacy, and Bishops named by the Crown.*

"At an early period Catholics used to be put to death for their denial of the kingly ecclesiastical supremacy.

The greatest and best of English judges, the Chancellor Sir Thomas More, was beheaded for denying that supremacy, and maintaining the Pope's.

"In the year 1829 was passed the Catholic Emancipation Act. By this, Catholics were freed from all obligation of swearing to, and consequently of acknowledging, the royal ecclesiastical supremacy; and an oath of allegiance was framed peculiarly for them, which excluded all declaration of belief in that principle.

"A Catholic, therefore, before 1829, in the eye of the law, was a person who did not admit the royal supremacy, and therefore was excluded from full enjoyment of civil privileges. A Catholic after 1829, and therefore in 1850, is a person who still continues not to admit the royal supremacy, and nevertheless is admitted to full enjoyment of those privileges.

"The royal supremacy is no more admitted by the Scotch Kirk, by Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, Independents, Presbyterians, Unitarians, and other Dissenters, than by the Catholics. None of these recognise in the Queen any authority to interfere in their religious concerns, to appoint their ministers for them, or to mark the limits of their separate districts in which authority has to be exercised.

"None of these, any more than Catholics, recognise in the bishops appointed by our Gracious Queen, in virtue of her supremacy, any authority to teach them or rule them. The real sway, therefore, of this spiritual prerogative is confined to that body of Christians who voluntarily remain subject to the ecclesiastical establishment called the Church of England.

"When, therefore, the Sovereign appoints a new bishop to a see, the Catholic, and I suppose the Dissenter, divides the act between two distinct powers. As Sovereign, and as a dispenser of dignities, the king or queen bestows on the person elected dignity, rank, and wealth. He is made a lord of Parliament, receives a designation and title, *becomes seized of certain properties, which entitle him to fines, rents, and fees.* [Yes, and means to keep them, too, so long as law can keep down that dangerous spirit of Jacobin innovation which won't let us sleep quietly in our beds. What is the Fifth of November good for, if squibs and crackers cannot preserve our tithes?] To all this they assent; they may protest, but they do not refuse the honours due to one whom the king is pleased to honour. The title is accorded, be it 'His Lordship' or 'His Grace' [It is in vain to protest against these vulgar sarcasms. He will fling a text at our heads about the Gentiles exercising 'lordship,' while so it shall not be among Christians]; his peerage is admitted, with all its consequent distinctions, and his fines and fees are paid as to any other landlord. [Is not this an act of schism?]

"If, in virtue of this commission, the bishop publicly *teaches or denies, as the case may be, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration,* [Why rip up old sores?] a Catholic no more heeds his teaching than he does that of a Dissenting minister. If he comes into a town, and invites all to come and be confirmed by him on a given day, no Catholic takes *more notice of the call than he does of the parish beadle's notices, among which it is fastened on the church door.* [Let this be a hint to 'keep ourselves more select.'] If he appoints a triennial visitation, for correction of abuses and hearing of complaints, no Catholic troubles himself about his coming. And what the Catholic does in regard to these functions of an Anglican bishop, an Independent does just as much.

"The commission given to civil and military officers flows from the temporal sovereignty, which none may impugn; while that to the ecclesiastical functionaries proceeds from the spiritual jurisdiction, which may be, and is, lawfully denied.

"When a Dissenter denies the royal supremacy (always meaning by this term the spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction attributed to the Crown), he substitutes, perhaps, for it some other authority in some synod or conference, or he admits of none other to take its place; but when the Catholic denies it, it is because he believes another and a true ecclesiastical and spiritual supremacy to reside in the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, over the entire Catholic Church. With him the two acts resolve themselves into one—denial of the royal supremacy and assertion of the Papal supremacy. And as it is perfectly lawful for him to deny the one, so it is equally lawful for him to assert the other. Hence Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, in the House of Lords, May 11th, 1846, spoke to the following effect:—

"He said that it was no crime in the Roman Catholic to maintain and defend the supremacy of the Pope; but that if he did it for mischievous purposes, and circulating immoral doctrines and opinions, he was liable to punishment by the common law; but if he merely maintained and defended, as he was bound to do, the spiritual authority of his superior, then he said that he was guilty of no offence against the laws of the country. The right rev. prelate (the Bishop of Exeter) had asked his opinion and that of the learned judges as to the right of the Roman Catholics to maintain and defend the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters. He said that it was no offence at common law for them to do so.

"The bishops and clergy are, of course, turning the crisis to their own best advantage, and associating their pretensions with the rights of the Sovereign. They are endeavouring, and will endeavour, to regain that influence which they have lost over the hearts of the people, and think to replace, by one burst of fanaticism, the religious ascendancy which years have worn away. But this will not be permitted them by a people too much enlightened on the subject of religious toleration, as enjoyed in England, to be easily fooled out of the privileges which it possesses. The nation will watch with jealousy any attempt to curtail or to narrow them, even though Catholics be the victims. Believe me, at this moment, the danger to the religious and civil liberties of Englishmen is not from any infringement on them by the Pope, in granting to English Catholics what I hope to show you that they had full right to obtain from him, but from those who are *taking advantage of the occurrence to go back a step if they can in the legislation of toleration,* and take away from a large body of Englishmen what at present is lawful to them in the regard to the free exercise of their religion."

This is what Dr. Cumming and his associate of Exeter avow. They deny the Emancipation Act as a blunder, and call for its repeal. Even the Minister hints in his letter a doubt of its results, and a disappointment in his anticipations of its effects. Nay, he pledges himself, if the law is not strong enough to persecute, to make a law with which Truro may work and Campbell may grapple, *if, upon mature deliberation, it may be advisable to legislate upon the subject.* We shall see—what we shall see; and so will the Catholic members in both Houses.

Meanwhile, with the Cardinal, we shall consider the answer to the inquiry:—

“Section 2.—What was the Extent of Religious Toleration granted to Catholics? Have they a right to possess Bishops or a Hierarchy?”

“The Act of Catholic Emancipation was considered, not only by those whom it benefited, but by all who consented to it, as an act of justice rather than of favour. It was deemed unjust to exclude from fair participation in constitutional rights any Englishman on account of his religious opinions. By this act, therefore, preceded and followed by many others of lesser magnitude, the Catholics of the British empire were admitted to complete toleration—that is, were made as free as any other class of persons to profess and practice their religion in every respect. ‘If the law,’ observed Lord Lyndhurst, ‘allowed the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be allowed to be carried on perfectly and properly.’”

“Hence to have told Catholics ‘You have perfect religious liberty, but you shall not teach that the Church cannot err; or, you have complete toleration, but you must not presume to believe holy orders to be a sacrament,’ would have been nugatory and tyrannical.

“Now, holy orders require bishops to administer them, consequently a succession of bishops to keep up a succession of persons in orders.

“Hence the Catholic Church is essentially episcopal; and to say, ‘You Catholics shall have complete religious toleration, but you shall not have bishops among you to govern you,’ would have been a complete contradiction in terms—it would have amounted to a total denial of religious toleration.

“When, therefore, emancipation was granted to Catholics, full power was given them to have an episcopate—that is, a body of bishops to rule them in communion with the Pope, the avowed head of their Church.

“To have said to Catholics, ‘You are perfectly free to practise your religion, and to have your own Church government, but you shall not be free to have it in its ‘proper and perfect’ form, but only in the imperfect form in which it has been tolerated while you had not liberty of conscience,’ would have been a tyranny, and, in fact, a denial of that very liberty of conscience.

“But the fact is a simple and plain one, that the law did not say so, and did not put on any such restriction: and we are to be governed by law, and not by assertions. *‘If the Catholics are at liberty by law to have bishops at all, they are as much at liberty to have local bishops as to have vicars apostolic.’*”

Nothing can be more unanswerable than this to any except those who, seeing as if they did not see, know as if they did not understand. To adopt any other construction of the dealings of the nation with the implied compact of peace with the Irish nation and the English Catholics, would be to convert a charter of liberty into a *congé d’élire*, which gives the chapters leave to elect any bishop they please of their own free choice, but threatens them with a *præmunire* if they elect anyone but the Queen’s nominee. Well may the Archbishop of Westminster ask—

“Then why all the clamour that has been raised? On what ground does the attack made upon us rest? Why have we been denounced—why held up to public hatred? Why pointed out to public fury? I have not seen one paper which, during the violence of the storm, thought it worth while to look into the question of law, and calmly inquire—‘Have the Catholics violated or gone beyond the law of the land? If not, why should they be thus perseveringly abused?’”

“Is it because the Church of England is supposed to be attacked by this measure of the Catholic Church, or its securities are threatened? This is the great and natural grievance of the Anglican clergy in their remonstrances. To this I reply, first, that, even when, in the Emancipation Act, Catholic bishops were restrained from taking the very titles held by the Anglican, this restriction was not intended or supposed to give the slightest security to the English Church. Speaking of it, the Duke of Wellington remarked, that ‘the [restrictive] clause was no security; but it would give satisfaction to the United Church of England and Ireland. According to the laws of England, the title of a diocese belonged to persons appointed to it by his Majesty; but it was desirable that others appointed to it by an assumed authority should be discontinued, and that was the reason why the clause was introduced. This was one of the instances which showed how difficult it was to legislate upon this subject at all. He was aware that this clause gave no security to the Established Church, nor strengthened it in any way; but it was inserted to give satisfaction to those who were disturbed by this assumption of title by the Catholic clergy.’”

“Even, therefore, our being restrained from adopting its very titles could give no security to the Established Church; so that we may conclude that still less security would be given to it by *our being forbidden to assume titles which are not theirs*. The legislation on this subject had clearly no bearing on the security of the Church of England; and if we are to be considered guilty of an aggression against her, and have to be dealt with by fresh penal legislation, for the purpose of propping her up, I do not see where you can stop, consistently, short of forbidding Catholics to have any bishops at all. You cannot make a law that they shall only be governed by vicars-apostolic, which would be acknowledging directly the Pope’s power in the realm (which the Protestant bishops under oath cannot do); still less can you proceed to forbidding them to have bishops of any sort, which would put them back into a worse condition than they were during the operation of the penal laws. Any step backward is a trenching on the complete toleration granted us.

“The appointment of a Catholic hierarchy does not in any way deprive the English Establishment of a single advantage which it now possesses. Its bishops retain, and, for anything that the new bishops will do, may retain for ever, their titles, their rank, their social position, their pre-eminence, their domestic comforts, their palaces, their lands, their incomes, without diminution or alteration. *‘Whate'er satisfaction it has been to you till now to see them so elevated above their Catholic rivals, and to have their wants so amply provided for, you will still enjoy as much as hitherto. And the same is to be said of the second order of clergy, Not an archdeaconry, or deanery, or canonry, or benefice, or living, will be taken from them, or claimed by the Catholic priesthood. The outward aspects of the two Churches will be the same. The Catholic episcopacy and the Catholic priesthood will remain, no doubt, poor, unnoticed by the great, and by the powerful (so soon as the present canonisation shall have subsided), without social rank or pre-eminence.* If there be no security for the English Church, in this overwhelming balance in its favour of worldly advantages, surely the exclusion of Catholics from the possession of local sees will not save it. It really appears to be a wish on the part of the clerical agitators to make people believe, that some tangible possession of something solid in their respective sees has been bestowed upon the new bishops—‘something territorial,’ as it has

been called. Time will unmask the deceit, and show that *not an inch of land, or a shilling of money*, has been taken from Protestants and given to Catholics."

Flesh and blood really cannot bear this! Why should a doubt be insinuated of the eagerness of the people to secure "domestic comforts, palaces, lands, and incomes," to such a deserving body?—a Church that indeed measures its own deserts by what it *takes*, a good deal more accurately than by what is given to it. And why this cruel cut about inches of land, or shillings of money. Does the satirist forget that he is speaking of the "Poor man's Church"—or, in other words, of the Church which makes a man poor? Oh, fie! I thought he had known better! But hear this:—

"Nor is an attempt made to diminish any of the moral and religious safeguards of that establishment which views our new measure with such watchful jealousy. Whatever that institution has possessed or done to *influence the people or attach its affections*, it will still possess and may continue to do. That *clear, definite, and accordant teaching of the doctrines of their Church*, that *familiarity of intercourse* and facility of access, that close and personal *mutual acquaintance*, that *face to face knowledge of each other*, that *affectionate confidence and warm sympathy*, which form the *truest and strongest and most natural bonds between a pastor and his flock*, a bishop and his people, you will enjoy, to the full, as much as *you have done till now*. The new bishops will not have occasion to *cross the path of the prelates of the Anglican Establishment* in their sphere of duty. They will find plenty to do, besides their official duties, in attending to the wants of their *poor spiritual children*, especially the multitudes of poor Irish, whose peaceful and truly Catholic conduct under the whirlwind of contumely which has just assailed them proves that they have not forgotten the teaching of their Church—not to revile when reviled, and when they suffer not to threaten."

Now I do not know how this is relished by the established hierarchy; but I confess I do not altogether like it. There ought to be scavengers of souls as well as of sewers, and why should "gentlemen of good property" run the risk of typhus when town missionaries are to be had cheap, or encounter the peril of cholera when a whole census of Bible readers may be hired for 15s. a week—a "renovated" black coat, with smooth hair (pomatum found), and a bilious white neckcloth? A joke's a joke—but there are "some subjects too serious to be trifled with—and parsons are one of them." The archbishop, on being asked to say grace at a peer's table, rebuked him for the liberty, and told him he never thanked God under royalty, or a crown prince at least. I like to see clergymen displaying a proper self respect, and knowing their place—which seems to be anywhere but in the cottage of the poor, or the bedside of the destitute or the dying. No; like Warren who paid a poet for his blacking—"we keeps a journeyman who does them there things;"—and, to say the truth, quite as much to edification as if the parson prayed in *propria persona*. But, then, if the Church *pays* for it, why should cardinals interfere?

The following is what I presume the Cardinal calls argument; and when a logician has nothing more substantial to appeal to, it may pass. But he bites against a file, and makes no more way with his opponent than the folks in the neighbourhood of the miser by hooting at him—"Populus me sibilat, at univernis in arca."

"When I read the frequent boasting of the papers, and the exulting replies of the bishops, that this movement in the Catholic Church, instead of weakening, has strengthened the Established Church, by rousing the national Protestantism and awakening dormant sympathies for its ecclesiastical organisation, I cannot but wonder at the alarm which is expressed. The late measure is ridiculed as powerless, as effete, as tending only to the overthrow of Popery in England. Then act on this conviction; show that you believe in it; give us the little odds of a title, which bestows no power, rank, wealth or influence on him that bears it, and keeps undisturbed those other realities, and let the issue be tried on these terms, so much in your favour. Let it be a fair contention, with theological weapons and fair arguments. If you prevail and Catholicity is extinguished in the island, it will be a victory without remorse. It will have been achieved by the power of the Spirit, and not by the arm of flesh: it will prove your cause to be divine. But if, in spite of all your present advantage, our religion does advance, does win over to it the learned, the devout, and the charitable—does spread itself widely among the poor and simple—then you will not check its progress by forbidding a Catholic bishop to take the title of Hexham or of Clifton."

This is what a sensible rector would call a *romantic notion*. But luckily, it will only go for what it is worth. The idea of quitting the vantage-ground of State power, and betaking one's self to reason and logic, and all that sort of thing, is *too ridiculous*. "Those other realities" are what "prove the cause" of Anglicanism "to be divine," and will prove too strong for all the dialectics in the world.

But to the next head of the discourse.

"Section 3.—How could Catholics obtain their Hierarchy?"

"We have seen that, not only we possess a full right by law to be governed by bishops, but that we have an equal right to be governed by them according to the proper and perfect form of episcopal government, that is, by bishops in ordinary having their sees and titles in the country.

"If we have a perfect right to all this, we have no less a perfect right to employ the only means by which to obtain it.

"We have seen that Catholics are allowed by law to maintain the Pope's supremacy in ecclesiastical and religious matters, and one point of that supremacy is, that he alone can constitute a hierarchy or appoint bishops. Throughout the Catholic world this is the same. Even where the civic power, by an arrangement with the Pope, names, that is proposes, a person to be a bishop, he cannot be consecrated without the Pope's confirmation or acceptance; and if consecrated already, he can have no power to perform any functions of his office without the same sanction.

"If, therefore, the Catholics of this country were ever to have a hierarchy at all, it could only be through the Pope. He alone could grant it.

"This is no new or unknown doctrine; it has long been familiar to our statesmen as well as to every one who has studied Catholic principles.

"Lord John Russell, in his speech in the House of Commons, August 6, 1846, thus sensibly speaks on the subject;—'It does not appear to me that we can possibly attempt to prevent the introduction of the Pope's bulls into this country. There are certain bulls of the Pope which are absolutely necessary for the appointment of bishops and pastors belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. It would be quite impossible to prevent the introduction of such bulls.'

"Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst: 'They tolerated the Catholic prelates, and they knew that these prelates could not carry on their Church establishments or conduct its discipline without holding communication with the Pope of Rome. No Roman Catholic bishop could be created without the authority of a bull from the Pope of Rome; and many of the observances of their Church required the same sanction. The moment, therefore, that they sanctioned the observance of the Roman Catholic religion in this country, they by implication allowed the communication [with the Pope] prohibited by this statute, and for which it imposed the penalties of high treason. If the law allowed the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be permitted to be carried on perfectly and properly; and that could not be without such communication. On these grounds he proposed to repeal the act.' (13th Eliz.)

"These quotations prove that in both Houses of Parliament the principle has been clearly laid down, that if Catholics are to have bishops at all, the Pope, and the Pope alone, can make them for them. Then it enters as completely into the principles of religious liberty that the Pope should name the hierarchy as that Catholics should have the right to possess one—a right as necessary for them as is for the Wesleyans that of having Conferences with superintendents."

Now I need scarcely say that, as an intelligent successor of the Apostles—for a rural dean—observes, "all this is *mere reasoning*." As the little Usher of the Black Rod said to Lord Thurloe, when he swore at him and his "messages from the other House," "You may damn the House of Commons as much at you please, my lord, but you *must not damn me!*" It is one thing for a Catholic prelate to take the titles of those vulgar fellows, the Methodists, but quite another to come too near the rights, privileges, and immunities of the Church established by law. Bumble must reign without a rival to his "own parochial authority."

I am about to introduce a novelty in the practice of editors—give a chapter of the text without a single commentary. Perhaps some ingenious Church friend may help me out with a few notes in the next edition; but meanwhile I confess my inability to add a word of criticism to the work of the author.

Section 4.—Does the appointment of a Catholic Hierarchy trench on the Prerogative of the Crown?

"This is, indeed, a delicate question; and yet it must be met. Every address and every reply of bishops and clergy assumes that the royal prerogative has been assailed.

"But this is nothing compared with the address to her Majesty, signed by some 100 members of the bar, to the effect that, by this measure, 'a foreign potentate has interfered with her Majesty's undoubted prerogative, and has assumed the right of nominating archbishops and bishops in these realms, and of conferring on them territorial rank and jurisdiction.'

"One naturally supposes that those who signed this memorial, being professionally learned in the law, have studied the question—have come to a deliberate conclusion as to the truth of their assertion. On ordinary occasions one would bow to so overwhelming an authority; on the present I think we shall not be wrong in demurring to its award.

"There is one point which I would beg respectfully to suggest to the consideration of persons better versed in law than I am.

"In this document, and in many other similar ones, including the Premier's letter, the Pope's acts are spoken of as real, and taking effect. The Pope has 'assumed a right,' he 'has parcelled out the land,' he 'has named archbishops and bishops.' If, according to the oath taken by non-Catholics, the Pope not only ought not to have, but really 'has' not power or jurisdiction, 'spiritual or ecclesiastical,' in these realms, it follows that, according to them, the Pope's ecclesiastical acts with regard to England are mere nullities, and are reputed to have no existence.

"I am confirmed in this view by Lord John Russell's explanation of the Protestant oath. 'The oaths now taken are not altered. We shall continue to take the oath, that "the Pope has not," &c.; though at the same time there is no doubt, in point of fact, that he exercises a spiritual authority in these realms. I have always interpreted the oath to be, that in the opinion of the person taking it the Pope has not any jurisdiction which can be enforced by law, or ought not to have.' Now, no one for a moment imagines that the Pope, or the Catholics of England, or their bishops, dream that the appointment of the Hierarchy can be 'enforced by law.' They believe it to be an act altogether ignored by the law; an act of spiritual jurisdiction, only to be enforced upon the consciences of those who acknowledge the Papal supremacy, by their conviction and their faith.

"Has this assumption of titles been within the terms of the law? Is there any law forbidding the assumption of the title of bishop? A certain Dr. Dillon assumed it, and ordained what he called Presbyters, and no one thought of prosecuting him. The Moravians have bishops all over England; and so have the Irvingites, or Apostolicals; yet no one taxes them with illegality."

I am a Liberal as well as a Protestant, and would fain remain a "steady party-man." But I find myself in the predicament of the sister of the Horatii. If I stick by Lord John, I cut off his political tail; and if I hold on by the tail, what is to become of the head? A brother dies if love prevails, and a lover perishes if a brother triumphs. However, the fight *must* come off, and with all the impartiality of a critic let me breathe the heroic sentiment "May the thickest skin stand the longest out!" Thus proceeds the Cardinal:—

“Section 5.—Has the Mode of Establishing the Hierarchy been ‘Insolent and Insidious?’

“The words in this title are extracted from the too memorable letter of the First Lord of the Treasury. I am willing to consider that production as a private act, and not as any manifesto of the intentions of her Majesty’s Government. Unfortunately, it is difficult to abstract one’s mind from the high and responsible situation of the writer, or consider him as unpledged by anything he puts forth. There are parts of the letter on which I would here refrain from commenting, because they might lead me aside, in sorrow if not in anger, from the drier path of my present duty. I will leave it to others, therefore, to dwell upon many portions of that letter, upon the closing paragraph in particular, which pronounces a sentence as awfully unjust as it was uncalled for on the religion of many millions of her Majesty’s subjects, nearly all Ireland, and some of our most flourishing colonies. The charge, uttered in the ear of that island, in which all guarantees for genuine and pure Catholic education will of necessity be considered, in future, as guarantees for ‘confining the intellect and enslaving the soul;’ all securities for the Catholic religion as security for the ‘mummeries of superstition,’ in the mind of their giver; guarantees and securities which can hardly be believed to be heartily offered; the charge thus made, in a voice that has been applauded by the Protestantism of England, produces in the Catholic heart a feeling too sickly and too deadening for indignation; a dismal despair at finding that, where we have honoured and supported and followed for years, we may be spurned and cast off the first moment that popularity demands us as its price or bigotry as its victim.”

If this be a specimen of the cardinal virtues, it is clear that “virtuous indignation” is one of them. He has forgotten that he wears a hat, and that in England a cardinal’s hat is a *caput-al* offence, to say nothing of the red stockings which usurp the uniform of her Majesty’s Church militant, the regiments of the line. Besides, although farthingales are obsolete, they are not repealed, and our grandmothers can tell us that to that truly British habiliment cardinals bear a dangerous resemblance. And what is a Protestant storm but a farthing-gale, a tea-cup tempest, a hurricane of church organ bellows? Those who can smell a rat should get their noses ready.

The foregoing quotation must have prepared the reader, as it has done many zealous country clergymen, for what they call “a great deal of stuff.” I wish I could get rid of it with that brief, free and easy dismissal; but my business is to edit, not to skip, and I must proceed on my “Canterbury Pilgrimage” with such palmers as choose to follow me.

“It was notorious that not only in Ireland the Catholic hierarchy had been recognised and even royally honoured, but that the same form of ecclesiastical government had been gradually extended to the greater part of our colonies. Australia was the first which obtained this advantage, by the erection of the archiepiscopal see of Sydney, with suffragans at Maitland, Hobart Town, Adelaide, Perth, Melbourne, and Port Victoria. Those prelates, in every document, take their titles, and they are acknowledged and salaried, as archbishop and bishops respectively, and this not by one, but by successive Governments.

“Our North American possessions next received the same boon. Kingston, Toronto, Bytown, Halifax, have been erected into dioceses by the Holy See. Those titles are acknowledged by the local Governments. In an act ‘enacted by the Queen’s excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Canada,’ (12th Vic., chap. 136.) the Right Rev. J. E. Guignes is called ‘Roman Catholic Bishop of Bytown,’ and is incorporated by the title of ‘the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Bytown.’

“In an act passed March 21, 1849 (12th Vic., chap. 31), the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh is styled ‘Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese of Halifax, Nova Scotia.’

“Lately, again, after mature consideration, the Holy See has formed a new ecclesiastical province in the West Indies.

“Galway was not an episcopal see till a few years ago. The Holy See changed the wardenship into a bishopric, and appointed the Right Rev. Dr. Brown, since translated to Elphin, first bishop of that diocese.

“In 1842 her Majesty was advised to erect, and did erect (5 Victoria, chap. 6), a bishopric of Jerusalem, assigning to it a diocese in which the three great Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were mashed into one see, having episcopal jurisdiction over Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia, subject to further limitations or alterations at the royal will. No one supposes that, for instance, the consent of the King of Abyssinia, in which there is not a single Protestant congregation, was asked. Mr. Bowyer also shows that Bishop Alexander was not sent merely to British subjects, but to others owing no allegiance to the Crown of England. Suppose his Majesty of Abyssinia or the Emir Beshir had pronounced this to be an intrusion ‘inconsistent with the rights of bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation,’ how much would this country have cared?

“Under the same statute a Bishop of Gibraltar was named. His see was in a British territory; but its jurisdiction extended over Malta—where there was a Roman Catholic archbishop, formally recognised by our Government as the Bishop of Malta—and over Italy.

“Under this commission Dr. Tomlinson officiated in Rome, and, I understand, had borne before him a cross, the emblem of archiepiscopal jurisdiction, as if to ignore in his very diocese the acknowledged ‘Bishop of Rome.’ He confirmed and preached there without leave of the lawful bishop, and yet the newspapers took no notice of it, and the pulpits did not denounce him. But, in fact, the statute under which these things were done is so comprehensive, that it empowers the Archbishops of Canterbury or York to consecrate not only British subjects, but subjects and citizens of any foreign state, to be bishops in any foreign country. No consent of the respective Governments is required; and they are sent not only to British subjects, but to ‘such other Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his or their authority.’

“If, therefore, the royal supremacy of the English Crown could thus lawfully exercise itself where it never has before exercised authority, and where it is not recognised, as in a Catholic country—if the Queen, as head of the English Church, can send bishops into Abyssinia and Italy, surely Catholics had good right to suppose that, with the full toleration granted them, and the permitted exercise of Papal supremacy in their behalf, no less would be permitted to them without censure or rebuke.”

Doctor Tomlinson officiated at Rome! Then the ignoring of established bishops has not been all on one side, and the Queen's prelate has committed an act of schism! I see how it is—the Cardinal's invasion of England was "insolent and insidious," but Tomlinson's intrusion into Rome was only an act of "true and manly British spirit." The awkward part of the affair is, that we are not allowed to enjoy a monopoly of toleration and Christian forbearance, but must be contented to go snacks in liberality and charity with the "man of sin and the son of perdition!" It is clear that, unless we take to persecution, we shall not be able to keep up the distinction betwixt a Protestant Bishop and a Pope.

"In 1841, or 1842, when for the first time the Holy See thought of erecting a hierarchy in North America, I was commissioned to sound the feelings of the Government on the subject. I shall not easily forget the urbanity of my reception, or the interesting conversation that took place. On the subject of my mission, the answer given (by Lord Stanley) was somewhat to this effect:—'What does it matter to us what you call yourselves, whether Vicars-Apostolic, or Bishops, or Muftis, or Imams, so that you do not ask us to do anything for you? We have no right to prevent you taking any title among yourselves.' In the debate on the Catholic Relief Bill, Lord John Russell spoke to the following effect:—'He believed that they might repeal those disallowing clauses which prevented a Roman Catholic bishop assuming a title held by a bishop of the Established Church. He could not conceive any good ground for the continuance of this restriction. . . . As to preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing could be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction.'

"I quote these passages, not for the purpose of charging Lord John Russell with inconsistency, but merely to justify ourselves, and show how little reason we could have had for believing that our acting strictly within the law respecting episcopal titles would have been described as it has; for if it was puerile in 1846 to continue to prevent Catholics even taking the prohibited titles, and no good reason existed for the continuance of even that restriction, is it manly in 1850 to denounce as 'insolent and insidious' the assumption of titles not different from those accorded to us by the authority which Lord John acknowledges can alone bestow episcopacy upon us?"

"I have already alluded to Lord Minto's being shown the brief for the hierarchy printed about two years ago."

I now approach the *grand finale* of this "Appeal." Like Lord Byron,

"I almost wish that I had ne'er begun."

I feel like Gulliver before the King of Brobdingnag, rather aggravated to hear my "beloved country" handled in the following very candid style. All I can say is, I had no hand in it; and I think I may answer for the venerable prelates of our venerated Church, that they have now attained to that measure of sagacity which fully appreciates the advantage of catching a Tartar, and that attainment in wisdom which wrung from Sir Toby Belch the valorous exclamation—"An' if I had known he'd been so cunning of fence, I'd have seen him damn'd ere I'd ha' challenged him!" Listen to this; the longer the ears, the better you will hear:—

"The diocese of Westminster embraces a large district, but Westminster proper consists of two very different parts. One comprises the stately Abbey, with its adjacent palaces and its royal parks. To this portion the duties and occupation of the Dean and Chapter are mainly confined; and they shall range there undisturbed. To the venerable old church I may repair, as I have been wont to do. But perhaps the Dean and Chapter are not aware that, were I disposed to claim more than the right to tread the Catholic pavement of that noble building and breath its air of ancient consecration, another might step in with a prior claim. For successive generations there has existed ever, in the Benedictine order, an Abbot of Westminster, the representative in religious dignity of those who erected and beautified and governed that church and cloister. Have they ever been disturbed by this 'titular?' Have they heard of any claim or protest on his part touching their temporalities? Then let them fear no greater aggression now. Like him, I may visit, as I have said, the old Abbey, and say my prayer by the shrine of good St. Edward, and meditate on the olden times, when the church filled without a coronation, and multitudes hourly worshipped without a service.

"But in their temporal rights or their quiet possession of any dignity or title they will not suffer. Whenever I go in I will pay my entrance fee, like other liege subjects, and resign myself meekly to the guidance of the beadle, and listen without rebuke when he points out to my admiration detestable monuments, or shows me a hole in the wall for a confessional. [Have a little mercy.]

"Yet this splendid monument, its treasures of art, and its fitting endowments, form not the part of Westminster which will concern me. For there is another part which stands in frightful contrast, though in immediate contact, with this magnificence. In ancient times the existence of an abbey on any spot, with a large staff of clergy and ample revenues, would have sufficed to create around it a little paradise of comfort, cheerfulness, and ease. This, however, is not now the case. Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and courts, and alleys and slums, nests of ignorance, vice, depravity, and crime, as well as of squalor, wretchedness, and disease; whose atmosphere is typhus, whose ventilation is cholera; in which swarms a huge and almost countless population, in great measure, nominally at least, Catholic; haunts of filth which no sewage committee can reach—dark corners which no lighting board can brighten. This is the part of Westminster which alone I covet, and which I shall be glad to claim and to visit as a blessed pasture in which sheep of holy Church are to be tended, in which a bishop's godly work has to be done of consoling, converting, and preserving.

"And if, as I humbly trust in God, it shall be seen that this special culture, arising from the establishment of our hierarchy, bears fruits of order, peacefulness, decency, religion, and virtue, it may be that the Holy See shall not be thought to have acted unwisely when it bound up the very soul and salvation of a chief pastor with those of a city, where the name indeed is glorious, but the purities infamous; in which the very grandeur of its public edifices is as a shadow to screen from the public eye sin and misery the most appalling. If the wealth of the Abbey be stagnant and not diffusive, if it in no way rescue the neighbouring population from the depths in which it is sunk, let there be no jealousy of anyone who, by whatever name, is ready to make the latter his care without interfering with the former.

"I cannot conclude without one word on the part which the clergy of the Anglican Church have acted in the late excitement. Catholics have been their principal theological opponents, and we have carried on our controversies with them temperately and with every personal consideration. We have had no recourse to popular arts to debase them; we have never attempted, even when the current of public feeling has set against them, to turn it to advantage by joining in any outcry. They are not *our* members who yearly call for returns of sines or episcopal incomes. They are not *our* people who form Anti-Church and State Associations. It is not *our* press which sends forth caricatures of ecclesiastical dignitaries or throws ridicule on clerical avocations. With us the cause of truth and of faith has been held too sacred to be advocated in any but honourable and religious modes. We have avoided the tumult of public assemblies and farthing appeals to the ignorance of the multitude. But no sooner has an opportunity been given for awakening every lurking passion against us, than it has been eagerly seized by the ministers of that establishment. The pulpit and the platform, the church and the town-hall, have been equally their field of labour; and speeches have been made, and untruths uttered, and calumnies repeated, and flashing words of disdain, and anger, and hate, and contempt, and of every unpriestly, and unchristian, and unholy sentiment have been spoken that could be said against those who almost alone have treated them with respect; and little care was taken at what time, or in what circumstances, these things were done. If the spark had fallen upon the inflammable materials of a gunpowder-treasure mob and made it explode, or, what was worse, had ignited it—what cared they? If blood had been inflamed, and arms uplifted, and the torch in their grasp, and flames had been enkindled—what heeded they? If the persons of those whom consecration makes holy, even according to their own belief, had been seized, like the Austrian General's, and ill-treated, and perhaps maimed, or worse—what recked they? These very things were, one and all, pointed at as glorious signs, should they take place, of high and noble Protestant feeling in the land—as proofs of the prevalence of an unpersecuting, a free-inquiring, a tolerant gospel creed!

"Thanks to you, brave, and generous, and noble-hearted people of England, who would not be stirred up by those whose duty it is to teach you gentleness, meekness, and forbearance, to support what they call a religious cause by irreligious means; and would not hunt down, when bidden, your unoffending fellow-citizens, to the hollow cry of 'No Popery!' and on the pretence of a fabled aggression.

"Thanks to you, docile and obedient children of the Catholic faith; many of you I know by nature fervid, but by religion mildened, who have felt indeed—who could help it?—the indignities that have been cast upon your religion, your pastors, and your highest chief, but have borne them in the spirit of the great head of your Church in silence and unretorting forbearance. But whatever has been said in ignorance or in malice against us, or against what is most dear to us, commend with me to the forgiveness of a merciful God, to the retributions of his kindness, not to the award of his justice. May he not render to others as they would have done to us; but may he shower down his kindnesses upon them in proportion as they would have dealt unkindly in our regard. The storm is fast passing away; an honest and upright people will soon see through the arts that have been employed to deceive it, and the reaction of generosity will soon set in. Inquiry is awakened, the respective merits of Churches will be tried by fair tests, and not by worldly considerations; and truth, for which we contend, will calmly triumph. Let your loyalty be unimpeachable, and your faithfulness to social duties above reproach. Shut thus the mouths of adversaries, and gain the higher goodwill of your fellow-countrymen, who will defend in you, as for themselves, your constitutional rights, including full religious liberty."

I have not suffered *my* pen to come betwixt the reader and the author. If this passage is too good for an archbishop, the anomaly may be accounted for by the fact that he is poor, and cannot afford to be stupid. Is there in all our six-millions-a-year hierarchy put together as much genius, wit, eloquence, and nervous dignity, as is competent to produce a peroration which will for ever remain a jewel in the diadem of British classics? If Wiseman be not an Englishman, I am sorry for it. His nativity is worth contending for. If he be, he is a countryman to be more proud of than all the fat-eared bed-ticks of episcopacy that "rot themselves in ease on Lethe wharf," while poverty, ignorance, vice, and crime rise, and riot, and glare around them, a scandal to the nation, and a terror to the thoughtful. They have raised the storm; Ignorance, the Faustus-monster of their neglect, comes at their bidding, and will become formidable to its creator who has put together its clay, but forgotten to breathe into it a soul. If it do not turn again and rend him, it is because he shows it another victim. But even a rabble are obedient to the voice of Charity and the charmed words of Reason. The Christian and the faithful shepherd will make his call heard above the roaring of the storm, and the tempest which the Cardinal could not avert his Appeal will allay.

*"Ac veluti, magno in populo cum saepe est
Seditio, scævitate animis ignobile vulgus;
Jamque faces et saxa volant, furor arma ministrat;
Tum, pietate gravem ac meritis, si forte virumquem
Conspexere silent, arectisque auribus astant:
Ille regit dictis animos, et pectora mulet."*

Upon the bigotry, fanaticism, and hypocrisy of this scandalous agitation, I despair of even this splendid Address making any impression. It is in vain to point to its disproof of the charges of persecution which are charged exclusively on the spirit of Romanism. If Catholics are liberal, they are accused of indifference; if they are strict, strait-laced, and exclusive, they are taunted with intolerance. Earl Grey, a Cabinet Minister, in his place in Parliament, proclaims his conviction that Popery should be established by the State as the religion of Ireland; and his colleague denounces the mere erection of Westminster into a dissenting see, as "insolent and insidious," and the worship of his fellow-subjects as "mummeries and superstitions." It is not the first Irishman that he has given reason to exclaim—

"You might have dissembled your love,
But why did you kick me down stairs?"

I have lived long enough in the world, and seen enough of it, to cease measuring a man's natural character by his religion. The circumstances of birth, habit, education, and temperament, choose our faith *for* us, and do not make it *by* us. The same creed is *not* the same to the ignorant and the intelligent. The callous and the cruel seize upon the terrors, while the kindly cling to the mercies of the same common law. The Catholic faith, we may be certain, was not read in the same spirit by a More and a Jefferies. The worship that could inspire a Pascal, and guide the life of Fénelon or Borromeo, cannot be far from that kingdom of heaven on the threshold of which Christ found the young man who yet would not follow him.

There is, indeed, but one *true* faith, but much truth in even false ones. If our high estimate of our own be correct, there is much more Protestantism in an intelligent Catholic, than in an ignorant professor of the principles of the Reformation.

Look abroad over your country. Mark the squalor, the animal grossness, the heathen ignorance, the pauperism, the drunkenness, the vice, the crime of the population. The masses of the people are Infidels—they are never seen in our churches, never invited, never drawn there. The shepherd is looking after the fleece. He is wanted to make a fourth hand at whist at the village dowager's. What would you have? Rather that the flock should remain practical Atheists, than be drawn to think of God and an immortal soul by the Romish priest, who, when all the world forsakes them, comes to the abandoned with his Master's message, and his Master's peace?

If the light of heaven cannot enter by the window of the understanding, or through the crannies of the conscience, what other inlet is there than through the keyhole of the senses? What are mummeries and superstitions of the wise, are the alphabet of ignorant devotion. It takes a large soul to take in the conception of eternity, an enlightened heart to see God in spirit and in truth. We are yet, all of us, but on the threshold of the true worship. We are but chained to our Mount Gherizim, or soul-bound to our Jerusalem. A time will come when man will neither need history, tradition, nor faith to lead him to the Universal Father—when the One True God will be an axiom of the understanding, and the beauty of virtue will be an intuition of the intellect. But it is better that Deity should be seen afar off, than not seen at all; better that, with the savage, he should be made with men's hands, than that the fool should say in his heart, "There is No God."

In superstition there are the germs of religion; in unbelief there rest but the shadows, clouds, and darkness of a chaos without form and void. The very Copt who kneels to the crocodile is groping his devious way to the unknown God. He who sees God in everything is guiding the future sage to see everything in God.

It is in vain to rail at Popery. I speak not of its past glories, of the service it has rendered to civilisation, of the nations which sat in darkness whom it has brought to the knowledge of the living God. It is yet, like Protestantism, in the infancy of its development. Truth never changes, and the Almighty is immutable; but man is ignorant and erring, and his conceptions of Truth and its Author are limited by his faculties, and bounded by his capacities and knowledge.

Catholicism supplies a great want in the human heart, which no agency that is not virtually Catholic can supply. There are many who cannot be religious by the cold assent of the understanding, and cannot be led to their knees by the thorny path of the logical propositions which go by the name of Calvinism. The passions, the senses, the imagination, the lower affections of man, are incapable of a pious direction except by the service which will first catch the ear, and fill the eye, and help the flagging soul upward by the veiled idolatry, the secondary conceptions of the presence of the Deity, which fill the anxious benches of the Revival, faint, and sob, and cry aloud in the Irving Conventicle, or bow in awe before the Host, and thrill with the solemn harmonies of the pealing anthem. To scoff at, revile, or suppress these agencies, is to neglect the very means which, in the construction of human nature, the Creator has appointed for the creature slowly to grope after Him, if haply he might find Him; for are not the whole human race, by very instinct, idolatrous? Is it, indeed, possible that we can know God as He really is, until we see Him face to face by being "like Him as he is?" And if our conceptions of God are any other or any less than what He is, are we not virtually worshipping a spectre of our own raising, not the King eternal and invisible. To us He is still, thus, the unknown God; we worship we know not what, or ignorantly worship.

"Man! frail man!
Dressed in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven,
As makes even the angels weep!

* * * * *
We are such stuff as dreams are made of,
And our little life is rounded with a sleep!"

The chryslais *must crawl* to heaven by earth steps and feelers; when it has its wings, it needs no element but heaven's ether. Religious forms are the ladders of the soul, without which it has not strength to leave the earth. Without the steps it would not seek to go, for it ceases to desire that which it cannot reach. The great heart that can grasp the thought of

eternity, and piercèd through the infinite to the everlasting, needs and asks no medium of assent, but springs at once to the source of its origin and the end of its destiny.

But how are our millions to be gathered into the fold by shepherds whose voice they cannot recognise, and whose guidance they will not trust? The gospel in any shape, faith in any form, is better than to live without God and without hope in the world. Offered but in one stereotyped aspect it will be rejected by millions in whom, otherwise recommended, it might have the rude germ, at least, of repentance and newness of life. There is only one name in Heaven, but many ways to it. Is not Romanism one of them? "Other sheep have I," said the great Teacher, "that are not of this fold." "If ye believe not Me, yet believe the *works*, that they are of God." What is even idolatry, but God veiled to the soul, not yet capable of gazing on the naked spirit of the Ineffable? What saint worship but a far-off homage through the spirit of the just man made perfect, the "friend of God," to the unapproachable Majesty, in the temper of him who lowly said, "Lord I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter?" The gross mind, the warm imagination, the heated fancy that cannot even pray without the alloy of human passion, *will* materialise religion. His soul is not self-sustaining. It can no more worship without the integuments of ceremonial, than Egypt could kneel without its hieroglyphs. It is not successful *finding* alone, but earnest *searching after*, God, that reveals Him who of a surety is no respecter of persons, but is the rewarder of him who diligently seeks him in *every* clime and country. To doubt that under many forms and through various outward adits frail man draws near Him according to his lights, is to deny the wisdom of His providence, and that His tender mercies are over all his works.

The fields are white unto harvest: why should the labourers be few? A nation is lying in wickedness: shall we not welcome *every* willing reaper? Must the crop rot on the ground rather than be gathered by other than privileged labourers? Believe me, we cannot spare one influence which can ever so remotely soften the hardened heart, and elevate or refine the gross affections. I profess a faith with few doctrines necessary to be believed, and many duties necessary to be performed. I ask for no middleman to stand between me and the Eternal Throne—no tradition to strengthen my assurance—no symbol to materialise the conception of that spirit which cannot be realised to the fervent fancy unless surrounded by, and enveloped in, the integuments of sacerdotal accessories. But I read the history of the world, and look out over the present seedfield of humanity, and can nowhere see the "Great Spirit" approached through such meagre service, or made present to the soul with so bare an usherhood; and I trace in the seen instincts and universal tendencies of human nature a providential law which as God has made so he will bless. He hath made all things beautiful in their time, and He winked even at the times of ignorance. Go on, then, cardinal—toil, bishop—labour you, presbyter—there is room and need for you all; let each grow together to the harvest, in the assurance that to labour is to worship, and that he worships best who best brings man to virtue and the sense that he is immortal. I do not despair even of the ministry of the "dapper divine, who preaches from the text, 'Let not your good be evil spoken of;'" and after showing first the nature of good, and second the nature of evil, perorates a sensation by concluding with the 'sin against the Holy Ghost.'" If I despair of the efficacy of any ministrations, it is that of those who boast of the purity of their faith and the simplicity of their doctrine. With George Selwyn, I believe that the uses of a teacher and a priest have a higher office, and a more edifying purpose, than that of "palavering God Almighty, and bullragging the devil."

If war still must rage, may it be a Christian warfare. Forget not your common Master in zeal for His service. Let Catholic and Protestant alike remember that—

"The greatest One that ere wore earth about Him
Was a sufferer. A meek, sweet, peaceful, humble, tranquil spirit—
The first *true gentleman* that ever breathed."

That all may thus adorn the doctrine of the Great Teacher is the fervent desire of,
Fellow-countrymen,

Your faithful Friend,
JOHN BULL.

(From the "Times," Nov. 21, 1850.)

We have now before us, in "The Appeal" of Dr. Wiseman, which appeared in our columns yesterday, and in the pamphlet of Mr. Bowyer, so frequently referred to in "The Appeal," all that can be said, or at least all that it is deemed prudent to say, in defence, or rather in palliation, of the recent attack upon the Established Church of England and the feelings and principles of her people. The question thus raised is well worthy of our most attentive consideration. If we have pronounced an opinion against the Pope and the Cardinal unheard, it has not been from any wish to deny them fair play, but because they did not condescend to give us any more tangible explanation of their acts than was to be gathered from empty gasconades and pompous manifestoes, the very sweepings of a literary wardrobe now nearly worn out, and never very tastefully selected. We congratulate Dr. Wiseman on his recovery

of the use of the English language. If the popular demonstrations with which the arrival of the new Cardinal, who has come with a commission from Rome to govern half-a-dozen of the dioceses of our Church, and some two of the kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy, have not been all that was agreeable in other respects, they have, at any rate, as the Scotch say, brought him to his English. We hear no more in "The Appeal" of the planetary system either of Cullen or Copernicus; suns, planets, and comets dance no more in the mazes of metaphorical confusion. England is suffered to remain where she is, and is no longer forced, to the great discomfiture of the continent, to revolve round the Eternal City. The golden chain of St. Peter rings no longer in our ears, and the adjacent islands to the Doctor's diocese, Thanet, Dogs, and all, do not once appear above the horizon. Grateful for the relief from the constant strain on our imaginative faculties, we can only express a wish that it were consistent with the rules of orthodoxy and infallibility that the Church of Rome, as she has one head, one faith, one code of morality, one system of politics, would be pleased to add to these multifarious unities the unity of language, so that her advocates might be spared the necessity of writing long arguments to prove that her public and authorised documents mean exactly the reverse of what they say. If Dr. Wiseman meant, as he and Mr. Bowyer say he did, that he merely came amongst us as a Dissenting minister, the head of a voluntary association, to manage the spiritual affairs of the Catholics scattered up and down England—if it was never intended to assume any rights, save those which are cheerfully conceded to a Wesleyan or a Baptist, why, in the name of common sense, could he not have said so? And why is it only when the unmistakable response of the people of England has shown him that his inflated pretensions will tend but little to the glorification or advancement of himself and his Church, does he first inform us that counties do not mean counties, but the Roman Catholics residing in them—that England is not restored to the Roman Catholic Church, but that her scanty Romanist population has received a new form of government? It is because the Roman Catholic Church has two languages, an esoteric and an exoteric—the first couched in the very terms of that more than mortal arrogance and insolence in which Hildebrand and Innocent thundered their decrees against trembling kings and prostrate emperors, the second artful, humble, and cajoling, seizing on every popular topic, enlisting in its behalf every clap-trap argument, and systematically employing reasoning the validity of which the sophist himself would be the last to recognise.

But, let her speak what language she will, the spirit of that Church is unchanged. Pliable and ductile without, she is stern and unbending within. Within her pale is salvation, without is heathen darkness. The Greek, who differs from her in thinking that the procession of the spirit was from one person of the Trinity instead of two, is, according to her, as far removed from salvation as the worshipper of Vishnu or Siva. Claiming universal dominion, to be established to the exclusion of all other forms of faith, is an essential requisite of her existence. Toleration to others she has ever regarded as a crime; toleration to herself, theoretically at least, as an insult. The commonly recognised distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* is no distinction with her. In her authorised documents whatever is not within herself is treated as non-existent; her language, her logic, are all founded on this principle. Whatever is not her own she absolutely ignores. The Pope employs the same style in constituting an Archbishop of Westminster as in appointing a prelate of some petty town of Latium. The existence of the Crown, of the prelates, of the mighty people of England, he cannot acknowledge; all he sees is the land, a few Roman Catholics scattered up and down it, and those bishops among whom he divides it; the rest to him is nothing. It was much to have tolerated such a Church as this; it was much to have extended to the Roman Catholics that toleration which, it was well known, if they were true to their faith, nothing but their weakness could render mutual. It was a fiery trial to the spirit of toleration when it was proposed to be extended to those who greedily caught at those immunities to the principle of which they are eternally opposed. Happily, and justly, as we think, the principle of toleration triumphed, and intolerance itself was tolerated, after the example of Him who makes his sun to rise and his rain to descend as well on the just as the unjust. But the Roman Catholics are no longer content with toleration. "True toleration and religious liberty," says Mr. Bowyer, speaking by authority, "consist in more than the absence of persecution and the possession of equal civil rights." That something more the Roman Catholic clergy do not ask from our generosity, but seize as their right; and the person whose fiat clothes them with these rights is a foreign Prince, having no diplomatic relations with this country. The momentous question is thus raised whether, the Roman Catholics being, by their own confession, free from persecution, and possessed of equal civil rights with the rest of her Majesty's subjects, we are not to concede to them, but acquiesce in their seizing, the further right of developing to their natural and inevitable results the constitutional tendencies of their Church; and, if so, at what particular point of the development we are to say, "You shall go no further?" If the erecting of a new episcopal hierarchy, and the assigning to them, to use the words of Dr. Wiseman, "a territorial ecclesiastical jurisdiction without personal limitations"—that is, without designating the persons over whom such jurisdiction is to be exercised—ought not to excite any feeling in England, because it is only a matter of the internal government of

the Catholic Church, where is this development to stop? We know from history that the infallible Roman Catholic Church developed her internal government after this fashion, till the world was astounded by the spectacle of three Popes at the same time reciprocally excommunicating each other; but the practical English mind, which, being unversed in these holy mysteries, has never yet seen two persons claiming rival episcopal jurisdiction over the same spot of English land, is still disposed to ask, "If this be development to your Church, is it not aggression on mine?"

(From the "Daily News," Nov. 21, 1850.)

It has now become incumbent upon every Protestant of this empire to consider well, and by his opinion aid in determining, upon what terms we are to live politically with our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. For the last half century and more, liberal men amongst us have entertained but the one idea upon the subject, and directed their efforts to the one aim, that of removing from the Roman Catholics all those marks of inequality or subjugation which were unfortunately, but inevitably, imposed upon them, as the consequence of that great struggle, in which Protestants made the principles of constitutional and religious freedom triumphant over absolutism of government and of creed.

During the half century's effort of the Liberals of this country completely to emancipate the Catholics, their prelates and leaders, both here and at Rome, preserved, with some Irish exceptions, a policy and a demeanour calculated to aid and strengthen that effort. Had that policy and that demeanour been continued, English and Irish Liberals would have advanced to the completion of the great work by some equitable settlement of the Church question in Ireland. Cardinal Wiseman, however, and the present advisers of the Pope, came to the opinion that the long, and brotherly, and fruitful alliance, so long subsisting between Catholics and liberal Protestants, had endured long enough. They do not want Protestant aid. They mock at fraternity; they fling alliance or conciliation to the winds. A Papal Bull, insulting to the nation, to its history, its noble struggles, and its as noble tolerance, is flung in the country's face. The most lofty of dignities is created, and titles assumed, in the rudest possible defiance and discourtesy of a Queen whose every act has been marked by liberality, kindness, and conciliation towards the Roman Catholics, their prelates, and their claims. And when this produces a national natural outburst, and a degree of intemperate indignation unavoidable under such a provocation, Cardinal Wiseman, who came in his own wolf's clothing to provoke, puts on the lamb's for a moment to expostulate, and inquire what is the matter? In truth, we almost prefer the open insolence of the Bull to the plausible and feline humility of certain portions of the *Appeal*.

The question, unfortunately, that Protestants are now obliged to put to Catholics is, If we struggle and succeed in placing you on an equality with us, will you, in turn, consider us on an equality with you? We believe that there is a large body of Roman Catholics who would say, yes: and, as Protestants, we would desire but that one small and simple affirmation. We would sink every grudge, and smooth away every difference. But the ultra-montane Catholics, the Cullens and the Wisemans, do not want any such fraternity, and will not tolerate any such equality. In their eyes we are rebels, heretics: the great and noble protest of the Reformation against errors which Roman Catholics themselves no longer hold, is looked upon by them as a crime; and the great struggle for civil liberty bound up with that religious protest, which has made this nation great and free as it is, that is another heinous sin. The object, therefore, of these political Romanists is to undo all that we have been doing for the last two centuries; and as long as we aid them to equality they accept that aid, but merely as a step towards re-establishing their old superiority and ascendancy. With English Catholics we might have equality and peace. But Dr. Wiseman tells us that, in *his* Catholicism there can be no "national Church." The Gallican Church of Louis XIV. and XV. in France; the Prussian Catholic Church, where education is secular and free, and where no prelate can be chosen by the chapter unless he be agreeable to the King—Cardinal Wiseman will have none of this. The new rule of the Court of Rome is to grasp all it can, immunity even from criminal and political jurisdiction in Piedmont, and the same, no doubt, here, as soon as there is power to demand it. Against such a political sect as this—for ultra-montane Catholicism is more a political than a religious sect—it is the duty of the State of England, even more than of its Church, to make a stand.

It is ordained by statute, and supported by the law of nations, of common sense, of national interest and pride, superior and anterior to any statute, that no foreign potentate shall have dominion in this country, either to confer rank and dignity, or authority and power. If the mortmain law can be evaded, the weakness of the death-bed taken advantage of to transfer the property of landed gentry to an agent of the Pope of Rome in this country—as we have shown to be the case—it is for Parliament to look

to it. If all education is to be rendered null, and if colleges voted by Parliament for the instruction of those who voluntarily repair to them are to be denounced by authorities appointed in this country by a foreign court, the same authorities can, in case of war, take part with a foreign enemy against us, and dissolve the people from their allegiance. All these are the attributes and characteristics of a political religion; and though the State may have nothing to command or prohibit in the way of dogma, it cannot suffer a political *imperium in imperio*.

According to some, all these difficulties and dangers may be met by separating Church from State, and by rendering the Government above and indifferent to the disputes and authorities of churches. That may be so, if the State retain the power of education, of regulating the laws of marriage and bequests, of monastic establishments, and of the temporal authority of vicars apostolic. But in this case the State, however separated from the Church, would have to exercise a stern resistance to the pretensions of a political Church, such as Dr. Wiseman, with one foot on the Vatican, with French and Austrian influence dominating there, and with another foot in Westminster, would exercise. Voluntarism itself would not free the State from the duty of that kind of resistance which we think imperative.

We shall not follow Cardinal Wiseman into his disavowal of the Queen's supremacy, or into his pleading that by the establishment of a hierarchy, with himself at its head, by virtue of the Pope's Bull only, he has not broken any statute. This will be for the law authorities to decide. He asserts that all this was done by the desire and petition of the Roman Catholic prelates and clergy. We believe this to be the very reverse of the truth. The Roman Catholic prelates and clergy in England desired no such thing. They desired local freedom and a national Church, having for its spiritual summit the authority of the Roman Pontiff, but not subjected to the absolute control of a self-appointed Roman agent. The Roman Catholic clergy in England are as much in Cardinal Wiseman's power, as ever Hungary was in that of Haynau. They of course say nothing. But the *régime* that has been established is as galling to them as insulting to Englishmen.

The differences, however, between Dr. Wiseman and his clergy, Dr. Wiseman and our law authorities, are not matters for us to decide. It is for the Attorney-General to give an opinion as to whether he has committed the breach of a statute; what we complain of is, that he has broken that tacit and long-subsisting pact between the great Liberal party in England and the Roman Catholics throughout the empire. We thought them, and still hope to find them, Englishmen. But he would make them Romans, or Austrians, or the intellectual serfs of any empire or ambitious power that may happen to dominate in Central Italy. It seemed wise and just to our Ministers to abet and recommend the introduction of constitutional government into the States of Italy, as the best way of reconciling the interests of the Sovereign with the spirit of the people. Not the Pope, indeed, but the Austrian and Neapolitan Cardinals, into whose hands he has fallen, have thought proper to take umbrage at our liberal advice. And they have entered in consequence into a system of petty and personal rivalry and retaliation, as despicable as it is unjust, impolitic, and illiberal. As this absolutist party in Rome employed Archbishop Franzoni to disturb Piedmont and create embarrassment to all Liberal Governments, so it has sent Cardinal Wiseman hither on the same errand. And we forthwith find him at loggerheads and personalities with our Ministers, just as Franzoni was with Azeglio. Not all the sophistry of Cardinal Wiseman can conceal these political moves, which we shall not cease to resist and expose, far more as Liberals than as Protestants.

(From the "Morning Post," Nov. 21, 1850.)

The much-looked-for manifesto of Cardinal Wiseman is now before the world; and it is from this Englishmen have to learn the best that can be said in defence of the recent act of the Pope towards this country. The Cardinal must have a bad opinion of the understandings of our countrymen if he supposes that he has any chance of deceiving them by an eloquent statement, which but faintly alludes to that which lies at the root of the question; which simply passes by every legal and political argument urged by the whole press of England, as "clamour," devoid of all reason; and tells us that we have been stirred up by our bigoted clergy (who yet have lost all hold on our respect) to a mere interested outcry against a harmless and oppressed race, the loyal Catholics of England and the meek martyrs of Ireland, who bear it all without as much as a complaining word.

England will yet tell Cardinal Wiseman that she knows what she is about better than he supposes. We have our own way of viewing and stating this great national question, and we shall not cast it away for the Cardinal's. We believe that this venturesome prelate is born to work out the fact that Popery of the ultramontane school is utterly incompatible with the progress of civilisation in Europe, or the existence of good civil government anywhere.

But let him state his own case. We pass over, for the present, the numerous topics demanding exposure—if he be not hardened against a mere moral infliction of that kind—

and we put the pith of the matter in his own few words before our readers, that they may see the paltry dilemma in which these cunning ecclesiastics, the Cardinal and his friends, imagine they have caught this great nation :—

“You cannot make a law (he says) that Catholics shall only be governed by Vicars-Apostolic, which *would be acknowledging directly the Pope's power* in this realm (which the Protestant Bishops under oath cannot do); still less can you proceed to forbidding them to have bishops of any sort, which would put them back into a worse position than they were in during the operation of the penal laws. Any step backward is a trenching on the complete toleration granted us.”

So the conclusion which we are required to deduce from this passage is, that we have committed ourselves, by our foolish generosity, to anything which may, under the cover of “spiritual” pretences, be attempted by the priests of Rome! With unmatched effrontery, we are told that we have admitted practically the Papal power among us, and, “for better or for worse,” we now must needs have it. Our “liberal” concessions of former years are calmly quoted as tying us to results which were deemed impossible at the time, and the suspicion of which was said to be utterly unworthy. What was then proffered with English sincerity is to be now levied and demanded with more than Italian craft. The Cardinal, in plain words, puts us to this: “Roman Catholics are now absolute subjects of the Pope. We give you no option. You shall admit us as ultramontanes, or not at all; persecute us again, if you dare! but if not, the Pope shall absolutely ‘govern’ his dioceses and ‘counties’ in England and Wales, in ‘all *spiritual* things,’ and give no account of his matters.”

We put it to the calm judgment of our readers, that the time is now fully come to try this question :—Whether such an amount of power as the Pope arrogates—the Pope of De Maistre, and not of Bossuet—is compatible with any government on earth? We ask whether, if England is not to be as disorganised and demoralised as all Europe, this “*spiritual* wickedness in high places” must not be put under a sterner restraint than statesmen have yet contemplated? A religion which binds all its subjects to obedience to one man, and that man a foreign priest; a religion which holds all its members by secret and compulsory bonds; a religion which is, in fact, a most exactly *organised social system*, a political combination, is something *more* than a religion, and must be dealt with as something more. Such is Romanism; a most formidable combination in any country, and the more formidable the more free. Such is Romanism; and it has pledged its absolute allegiance to the Pope, who will wield it at his will.

The sophistries of this Jesuitical “appeal,” by which the laity of England are to be cajoled at the expense of their clergy—Anglican laymen, according to Cardinal Wiseman, being all just, and generous, and manly, and fair, and Anglican clergymen all full of avarice, uncharitableness, and venom—must be laid bare with no sparing hand. Our social system is at stake, as well as our “Constitution.”

* * It has been found impossible to get in all the Leading Articles intended the remainder, with a variety of Letters, &c., from Bishops of the Established Church, will appear in the Seventh Series.

CONTENTS.

THE “ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.”

FIRST SERIES.—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the two Letters to the “Times” by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the “New Batch of Bishops,” from the “Weekly Dispatch;” two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's “Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;” concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES.—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 2, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, Nov. 7, 1850.

THIRD SERIES.—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the “Vatican Masquerade.”

FOURTH SERIES.—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, by John Bull; Speech of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the “Queen and the Pope.”

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and the Leading Articles of all the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of “Catholics;” and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

DR. CUMMING'S CONCLUDING LECTURE,
AND A NOTE BY THE EDITOR;
LETTER OF THE HON. MR. LANGDALE;
THE BIRMINGHAM MEMORIAL;
A ROMAN CATHOLIC EXPLANATION OF THE "PAPAL
AGGRESSION;"
CARDINAL WISEMAN; AND
CONVERSION OF MR. HENRY W. WILBERFORCE.

DR. CUMMING'S SECOND AND CONCLUDING LECTURE.

Admiral Harcourt occupied the chair, and after the Divine blessing had been asked by Dr Cumming,

The gallant CHAIRMAN rose and said, that he rejoiced at again seeing that room so crowded, for it exhibited an anxious desire on the part of English Protestants to acquire a knowledge of that system of Popery which was now threatening to envelope the land in darkness and superstition. (Cheers.) He rejoiced that their Protestant feeling had not abated, but was well kept up; and he trusted that it would continue to be kept up in a right and proper spirit, with a solemn and serious conviction of the necessity and the duty of opposing that which was evil and promoting that which was good. (Cheers.) He warned them against the craft, the deceit, and the subtlety of the Papacy; for whatever it might say, its real intent was to obtain a victory over Protestantism. (Cries of "It never shall," and cheers.) Its object ever was and ever would be "supremacy"—(hear, hear)—but that we never could and never would surrender. (Cheers.) He was happy to say he had just learned that the clergy and ministers of Hastings had begun the delivery of a series of controversial lectures against Popery. (Hear, hear.) That was the right way to begin; and he rejoiced that the movement was not isolated to one portion of the community; that it was not the clergy of the Establishment alone, but that other ministers of the Gospel had joined in the noble work. (Cheers.) They greatly stood in need of union, for union was strength; and what he wanted to see, was all their energies and activeness put forth in the great and holy cause of Protestantism. He had recently been attending several meetings at Chelsea, and he was happy to say that in every memorial there adopted, Puseyism had been denounced, as well as Popery. (Loud cheers.) And he was delighted to find that the Evangelical ministers of the Church of England were not hiding the matter secretly within their own bosoms, but were openly denouncing the Puseyite ministers of the Established Church as the most insidious, crafty, and dangerous enemies of the truth. (Great cheering.) It was the laity of the Establishment who must be looked to for the destruction of the Puseyite heresy; and their first duty should be to memorialise their bishops to ordain none of that sect—(cheers)—to memorialise the Queen that she would endeavour, as far as lay in her power, to check the spread of this awful heresy; and especially were they called upon to carry on this work in a spirit of humility and prayer. (Cheers.) The motto on their banners should be—"No peace with Rome." (Cheers.) Dr Wiseman professed that he would be very diligent amongst the poorer class of the population; but what would be said of the man who, professing to carry food to the poor, supplied them with poisoned bread to their souls' destruction? (Cheers.) Romanism was the embodiment of error and superstition. Protestantism was founded upon God's Word—the Word of truth. And

"He is the freeman whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside."

Dr. CUMMING then rose to address the meeting, and his doing so was the signal for an extraordinary demonstration of feeling. The whole audience stood as one man, and cheered for several minutes, the act being accompanied by the waving of hats and handkerchiefs. When silence had been restored, Dr. Cumming proceeded to say that he was anxious to preface his remarks with one request, and it was this—that owing to the importance

of the words he was about to utter, and especially as Cardinal Wiseman had not thought fit to appear, but had, within a few minutes, sent him a missive, the audience would notice well and weigh well the *ipsissima verba* that he should now employ. (Hear, hear.) In the *Times* newspaper a day or two ago, he found the report of a sermon preached on Sunday last, by Dr. Doyle, in the Roman Catholic cathedral in Southwark, and in that sermon the following words occurred:—"Amongst other things, they have spoken of an oath which they assert every cardinal, upon his appointment, takes before the Sovereign Pontiff." Now his (Dr. Cumming's) precise words upon that subject in the speech he delivered on Thursday week were these:—"Let me presume, that when the Cardinal was made an archbishop, he received the *pallium*, a robe woven from certain sheep, tended I believe, by certain nuns; ceremoniously spun, ceremoniously woven, and ceremoniously put upon the archbishop. When he received the *pallium*, he repeated a solemn oath, which will be found in the 'Pontificale Romanum.' I have the book, and have carefully examined all that he must say. It is the edition of Clement VIII., Antwerp edition, 1627." Now Dr. Doyle said his statement was, that as a "cardinal," every cardinal upon his appointment made a certain oath; but his (Dr. Cumming's) statement was, that every "archbishop," upon receiving the *pallium*, made a certain oath. A cardinal was a temporal officer, with temporal jurisdiction, who might be made Pontiff and Sovereign of the States of the Church, as well as chief bishop of the Roman Catholic communion. An archbishop was an ecclesiastical officer; and he (Dr. Cumming) stated, speaking on the documents of that Church, authorised, accredited, signed, supersigned, and of all dates, that the "archbishop," on receiving the *pallium*, must repeat the oath, which, as a bishop, when consecrated, he had taken before. Dr. Doyle went on to say—"I declare that the accusation is a falsehood—no such oath has been taken by his Eminence. It has been commented upon at public meetings and in the newspapers, and the public mind has been thus inflamed against the Roman Catholics. It has been even said that the Cardinal had to take that oath at the footstool of the Pontiff. Now, I declare that there is no oath of the kind taken at all." Mark what followed:—"There is an oath taken by a bishop; but there is no such oath taken by a cardinal. Let me inform you what the oath taken by a bishop is. He promises in that oath to pursue and combat error, and to uphold the sacred doctrines of the Church." Then he went on to say—"They talk of the edict of Queen Mary, and lay it at the door of the Catholic clergy. I deny that that is true, and I refer our detractors to that history which they so wilfully pervert. What is the fact with regard to this very edict of Queen Mary? And now that I may presume that many Protestants are present, let me impress upon them the justice of paying attention to what I am about to state. Now, the true version of Queen Mary's edict in connexion with the Catholic clergy is this; on the very day that that edict was sent forth, that great, and good, and fearless friar, Alphonse de Castro, when he preached before the Court, in the presence of her Majesty, denounced it," and so forth. But he would come to this by-and-by—to return now to the oath. If they had heard that a certain individual had been made a bishop according to the rites of the Church of England, and they wished to know what those rites were—what would they do? Open a Prayer Book and read the forms and orders for the consecration of bishops and would they not say, if any one had been made a bishop contrary to, or with the omission of, what was there authoritatively enjoined, that there was wanting in that bishop's consecration something which in the view of a churchman was essential, necessary, and dutiful? (Hear.) He (Dr. Cumming) had quoted first of all the "Pontificale Romanum," published at Antwerp, and the date of which he had given. To be perfectly sure, he had brought with him now a copy of that work, with the notes of Catalano. Here was one volume out of the three. It was called the "Pontificale Romanum;" or that book according to which every bishop must be consecrated, every archbishop receive the *pallium*, every priest be ordained, every bishop bless, every bishop curse, every priest baptise, every officer excommunicate. It was the "Pontificale Romanum," as revised and issued upon the authority of two Popes, viz., Clement VIII. and Urban VIII., and was dated Rome, 1738. That they might be perfectly sure of the force and value of this he would read a single sentence from the bull of Clement VIII., which was prefixed to it. In that bull the following words occurred (in Latin):—"Resolving, that we withdraw all former editions, and determine that the aforesaid Pontifical shall, in no part, be changed, that nothing shall be added to it, that nothing shall be subtracted from it; and that whosoever shall perform sacred offices are bound to observe it, and that otherwise performing them by omitting anything, or subtracting anything, have not observed the conditions or duties attached to it." He would refer now to the 236th page of Catalano's edition, in which an account was given of the *pallium*, and its reception by an archbishop. There it was stated that the *forma juramenti* was exactly the same as at the consecration of a bishop; and turning to another page for that oath, he found that it contained a clause which was exactly as he had quoted it in his previous discourse:—"Hereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles Domino nostro, vel successoribus prædictis, PRO POSSE, PERSEQUI ET IMPUGNABO;" which being translated, meant—"All heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our lord the Pope, or his aforesaid successors, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power." Anxious to ascertain if he had translated this passage aright, he opened an admirable sermon preached by a first-rate

man upon the subject—Dr. Wordsworth the Canon of Westminster, who had quoted it in the following way:—"I, Nicholas (applying it to Cardinal Wiseman), elect of the Church of Westminster, to the utmost of my power will persecute and *wage war* with heretics and schismatics." Now he (Dr. Cumming) had been charged with giving a mis-translation, but the Rev. Canon Wordsworth had translated it much stronger than he had done; and he observed that his friend Mr. Burgess, the rector of Chelsea, had declared that to enable Englishmen properly to understand it, it ought to be translated, "I will persecute and *pitch into*." (Cheers, and roars of laughter.) Referring to the "Pontificale Romanum" again, he found it stated there that as soon as the elect archbishop had taken the oath, he received the *pallium* at the altar, "*de alteri accipit*." (A Voice.—"What do they call a *pallium*?"—laughter.) It was a robe woven out of wool produced from certain sheep, which sheep belonged to the nuns of St. Agnes. (Oh, oh, and laughter.) He (Dr. Cumming) put it to the meeting, then, that according to a document to which nothing was to be added, and from which nothing was to be subtracted, the archbishop in receiving the *pallium*, as he stated that he did receive it, had to make the oath, a portion of which he had read to them, and the remainder of which he would discuss by-and-bye. (Hear, hear.) But lest it should be supposed that he had quoted from an obsolete book, or that the ceremony was changed, he had been at great trouble within the last few days in hunting up Roman Catholic books upon this subject; and in fact Roman Catholic books had furnished him with most of his ammunition to-day. His search had been successful, and he had found out an edition of the same work—"The Pontificale Romanum"—in three volumes, published at Mechlin, and dated 1815. Opening this book he found, not only the horrible curse which he had read from the older edition, but that the archbishop, in receiving the *pallium*, was to make precisely the same oath that he had so read to them:—Hereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles Domino nostro, vel successoribus prædictis, pro posse, persequar et impugnabo." (Cheers.) And prefixed to it were the bull of Urban VIII. and the bull of Benedict XIV., quoted by Cardinal Wiseman in his defence, and the latter of which said, "This, our *pontificale*, restored and reformed, we command to be observed by all the churches of the world"—"*omnibus, universi terrarum orbis ecclesiis*." "Resolving that the aforesaid *pontificale* is in no part to be changed, in no part to be added to, in no part to be abstracted from." What was the inference from all this? Why, that if there were any truth in this book, if there were any authority in this Pontificale, Cardinal Wiseman did swear, "Omnes hereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles Domino nostro, vel successoribus prædictis, pro posse, persequar et impugnabo." (Cheers.) A few minutes before he (Dr. Cumming) entered that room he received a letter from St. George's, Southwark, with a cross prefixed to it, and signed "Francis Searle," which was the name of the gentleman who acted as Cardinal Wiseman's secretary. That letter inclosed another, which it stated had been forwarded to the editor of the *Times* on Tuesday last, but had not yet appeared in that journal. The inclosure was as follows:—

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"*St. George's, Southwark, Nov. 19.*

"Sir,—Dr. Cumming, in his letter in your paper of to-day, gives an extract from the oath taken by bishops and archbishops, copied from the 'Pontifical,' printed at Antwerp in 1627, and states, 'I presume, that Cardinal Wiseman, on receiving the *pallium*, took that oath.' To prevent further misunderstanding, I have the Cardinal's permission to state to you that, by a rescript of Pope Pius VII., dated April 12, 1818, the clause quoted by the rev. doctor, and so subject to misunderstanding, is omitted by all bishops and archbishops who are subject to the British Crown."

(Cheers, oh, oh, hisses, and laughter.) This showed, at all events, what was the splendour of that Crown, if it were true, and what was the pressure of the subjects of that Crown, even upon the Vatican itself—if that were true. (Cries of "hear.") The writer went on to say:—

"The authorised copy, now lying before me, used by our bishops, is headed—

"FORMA JURAMENTI.

"Pro Episcopis et Vicariis Apostolicis Episcopali dignitate præditis, qui in locis Magnæ Britanniæ subjectis versantur, præscripta a SS. Pio P. VII., die 12 Aprilis, 1818."

"In the copy of the 'Pontifical' kept at the episcopal residence in Golden Square—the copy, perhaps, generally used in consecration of bishops in England—the sentence is cancelled."

What a sleepy archbishop to go and consecrate bishops, and not to know what they were doing—not to know whether these things were done or not. (Cheers.) He proceeded—

"Dr. Cumming is at liberty to inspect this if he will arrange with me for that purpose,"—and call at the episcopal residence, in Golden-square! (Loud laughter.) "I'll go there," exclaimed Dr. Cumming, with much emphasis. (Great cheering.) But, continued the rev. doctor, he had some disclosures to make with respect to Dr. Doyle's statement and De Castro's book that would horrify all England. He wanted this to be riveted upon their minds. He did not want Dr. Wiseman to escape by means of his Jesuit sophistry. (A voice, "Go with the police;"—laughter.) No, he was not afraid; he would go alone. (Loud cheers.) Did

they ever hear of a Scotchman who was afraid of anybody? (Great cheering.) The letter added—

“When Cardinal Wiseman was consecrated bishop, in Rome, 1840, he took the English form of oath. On receiving the *pallium*, at which ceremony I assisted, his Eminence took no oath, cardinals being exempt. Had he been required to do so, he would, no doubt, have repeated the same form.”

Why, what laws had this man? Here was a solemn Pontificale which he was bound to observe, under the most solemn conditions, with the most solemn bulls prefixed; here was a document which all priests, bishops, and archbishops were bound to observe, on which Catalano wrote notes, and which stated that when the archbishop received the *pallium* he must take that oath, and that until he had taken that oath he could not receive the *pallium*; and yet the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster said that he did not take that oath. (A voice, “Oh, it won’t do” —cheers.) Now suppose that he did not take that oath. Urban VIII. and Benedict XIV. both stated that nothing was to be changed in, added to, or subtracted from the Pontificale; but Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. said that anything might be added to or subtracted from it and that it might be treated in any way Dr. Wiseman pleased to suit the British Crown. (Hear, hear.) The Church of Rome assumed that it was the united Church, and that we heretics were all at issue with one another. But what was really the case with Rome? Why, two Popes said, “You must not add to, subtract from, or do anything contrary to this Pontificale;” whilst other two Popes, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. said, “You may chop and change, and do anything you like with it.” If such were the boasted unity of the Church of Rome, then he (Dr. Cumming) thought we had much better have the disunion of Protestantism. (Loud cheers.) If this work were true, what was the fact? That the Pope was not only the interpreter of law, but the creator and changer of law, making the whole Papacy suit the specific and untoward circumstances in which its subjects were placed in this gloriously Protestant country. (Cheers) If this were true, the bishops for the time being were the minions, the creatures of the Pope, subject to him, sworn to him, and must be obedient to him. (Hear, hear.) Was it not very odd that the very clause in the oath which he had read, and which he had shown to be incompatible with loyalty to the Queen or charity to her subjects, was the clause which Cardinal Wiseman shuffled about, and said that he did not take it? But more than this, he found that Dr. Doyle, who was merely the mouthpiece of Cardinal Wiseman, had stated that the bishops did take an oath; and though Cardinal Wiseman said he took an oath with that clause omitted, Dr. Doyle declared that he took an oath the words of which were that he promised to pursue and combat error. This surely gave enough of catch-word to enable us to see that that was the very clause alluded to; and yet Dr. Doyle gave it in a form in which the Cardinal said he did not take it at all. (Cries of “Rank Jesuitism.”) Choose between them! He (Dr. Cumming) solemnly declared that the letter of Cardinal Wiseman and the sermon of Dr. Doyle had turned over a new leaf in the dread chapter which would be unfolded in this country, with all its terrible results, if Protestants were not true to the Bible, and Englishmen not true to the Constitution. (Loud cheers.) Bishop Doyle, in preaching from the pulpit, after a conversation with His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, said that the statement that Queen Mary’s bloody edict was sanctioned by the Church, was contradicted by the fact that that fearless, that great, that good friar Alphonsus de Castro, when he preached before the Court in the presence of her Majesty, denounced them as most intolerant, unjust, and in every degree opposed to the glorious principles and spirit of the holy religion—and it was the same Church now as in the day that De Castro defended it against the acts of those who were sinning against it. Would it not be inferred from this, that when that great, that good, that courageous friar denounced the persecuting edicts of Queen Mary; and when Dr. Doyle said that the principles and spirit of the Church of Rome were precisely what they were, as exemplified by Alphonsus de Castro; would it not be inferred that this De Castro was a grand exception, had never persecuted heretics, and had denounced everything like confiscation of property, destruction of life, deposition of Queens, and release of subjects from oaths of allegiance? (Hear, hear.) Would it not be inferred that the writings of this Alphonsus de Castro breathed all that was beautiful and amiable in Christianity, and depicted Rome as she herself would desire to be exhibited under the British Crown? He (Dr. Cumming) had, at much trouble, been able to procure a copy of De Castro’s works; and here it was. De Castro, who had been a friar, was made an archbishop just before his death; and, no doubt, if he had lived long enough, he would have been created a Cardinal. The title of this book was “De Justa Hereticorum Punitione”—that was, concerning the just punishment of heretics—the Madrid edition, 1773. This was the gentleman who had been recommended by Bishop Doyle as the true exponent of the principles of his Church. This was the gentleman who, he said, rebuked the sanguinary edicts of Queen Mary, and was the true representative of what the Church was and should be. Dr. Cumming then translated and read several passages from this work. At chapter 5, page 98, it stated that “there were various punishments which ecclesiastical law sanctioned, and imperial law ordered, heretics to be visited with. Some were corporeal, and affected the body. Among the corporeal punishments, one which very much annoyed the heretics was the confiscation of their property.” (Laughter.) The second punishment, mentioned in chapter 7, page 105, was the deprivation of every sort of

pre-eminence, jurisdiction, and government which they had previously exercised over persons of every condition. This authority was lost by manifest heresy; so that a king, having become a heretic, was, *ipso jure*, deprived of his kingdom; and a queen, being a heretic, was deprived of her sceptre: and not only so, but a duke, being a heretic, was deprived of his dukedom. (Laughter, and "Oh! Let them only tell the Duke of Wellington that." Roars of laughter and cheers.) Nor ought, it went on to say, any one to wonder that the Pope, on account of the crime of heresy, deprived a king of his dignity and stripped him of his kingdom; because kings, like other subordinates, were subjects of the Sovereign Pontiff. (Sensation.) Then it was asked, if the king became a heretic, on whom did the sovereign power devolve? To which this answer was given—Not on the emperor, especially if the king be not subject to the emperor, such as the King of France, of Spain, or of England. Again, it was stated that if an heretical king had no heir, or if the heir were a heretic; then, if the nation were not infected with heresy, it had the power and the right of electing a king; but if the people were infected with the pestilence of heresy, they would be deprived, *ipso jure*, of the power of choosing a king for themselves, and the whole business would devolve upon the Sovereign Pontiff. The last punishment of the body for heretics was death, "with which we will prove, by God's assistance, that heretics ought to be punished." At page 123, chap. 12, De Castro stated, that in order to create a horror of so great a crime as heresy, and produce in others a detestation of it, it was just to inflict the punishment of death on an incorrigible heretic; that there was no crime for which one might be more justly put to death than for fixed or incurable heresy; that if Martin Luther, when he began to pour out his poison, and after being admonished would not repent, had been capitally punished, as he deserved, his followers would have been terrified, and there would not have burst forth so many heresies in Germany. The author also described the different modes in which heretics were to be punished. He said, "We have shown that a heretic may be put to death; but in what manner he may be put to death is of very little consequence—(laughter)—for, whatever the way, it is always to the good of the Church, because a nuisance is removed, which if alive he might create, and terror is struck into others, so that they shall not dare to teach and preach these things." Various punishments for heretics were then described as being in use in France, Spain, and Flanders. Englishmen would recollect what the Papists did with Wickliffe's remains. Whenever he (Dr. Cumming) went to Lutterworth, he recalled to mind that bright and blessed star, and how they dug up his bones and cast them into the Avon.

"The Avon to the Severn runs,
The Severn to the sea;
And Wickliffe's dust shall spread abroad
Wide as the waters be."

And so it was. They thought to extinguish the glorious truths which that faithful one preached and preaching and holding which, he died in peace. (Cheers.) But what had been the fact? That the Avon which carried his dust to the Severn, the Severn which carried his dust to the sea, and the sea which carried that dust to all the shores of the world, had awakened civilised humanity to a sense of that horrible transaction. (Cheers.) He (Dr. Cumming) had now given them the opinions and sentiments of Alphonsus de Castro, of whom Bishop Doyle had, in the pulpit of St. George's Cathedral, spoken as "the great, the good, the fearless friar." (Loud cheers.) It must now be acknowledged that he had completely identified Cardinal Wiseman with Alphonsus Liguori and his sentiments, and Dr. Doyle with the theology and sentiments of Alphonsus de Castro. Next, he wished to identify the master of them both, Pope Pius IX., to whom they owed allegiance, and of whom they were the subjects, with Pius V. and his sentiments. Now, Pius V. had been made a saint, and Pope Pius IX. had chosen him for his patron, and said that the example and sentiments of that celebrated Pope were to be his example and sentiments. But what was the history of this Pius V.? First, he was a great supporter of the Inquisition; and next, the author of the infamous bull for dethroning Queen Elizabeth. In that bull he said, "Christ has constituted me over all nations and realms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, demolish and build up. The said Queen Elizabeth we deprive of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatever; and absolve all the nobles, subjects, people of the kingdom, and whoever have sworn to her any oath of duty or fealty whatever." That was the man whose example and teaching Pope Pius IX. had declared that he would follow. (Hear, hear.) Now, this was what he (Dr. Cumming) wished done. Let the Queen or Parliament say to Pope Pius IX., "You, Pope Pius, are a foreign Sovereign. You have sent here a certain bull, parcelling out the country in dioceses; we care not a fig though you may call the act merely ecclesiastical or spiritual; you take back your bull. We bid you do so, or, as sure as you live every bishop, that the bull constitutes shall be put on board a 120-gun ship and sent back to you. You take your bull as publicly down the Thames as you publicly brought it up the Thames. And if you don't do so—you, a foreign prince and a foreign Pontiff—then a 120-gun ship, with Admiral Harcourt in command, shall carry those bishops, created by that bull, to the banks of the Tiber, and there leave them in congenial darkness to settle the whole matter. (Repeated volleys of cheering.) I have great faith (continued Dr. Cumming) in the public sentiment upon this question. The lightning is strong—the thunder is strong—the earthquake is strong;

but there is an inspired, pure, Protestant, scriptural, public sentiment which smites the loftiest cedars and brings down the strongest fortresses, and which the Pope and his rescripts will not long be able to withstand. (Loud cheers.) There was another clause of the oath which Dr. Doyle did not deny, and which promised fealty to the Pope, which fealty was defended in ancient Romish writers. In looking into one of the Maynooth class-books the other day, he met with the following statements:—"The Church commands that, as far as possible, the canons be observed. She indulges in cases of necessity that they be occasionally relaxed. And she tolerates whatsoever she cannot punish without inconvenience." What light did not that cast on Cardinal Wiseman's letter? The oath which he had taken, and which he said had one clause omitted when it related to England, had still a clause left which made the Cardinal say that he would support the royalties or regalia, that was the sovereign pretensions, of the Popes and their successors. And Baronius, the celebrated Catholic historian, stated in his "Annals," that the political power should be subject to the sacerdotal power. The same doctrine was to be found stated in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, and in the Bull of Sextus V. Pope Pius V., now canonised, had acted upon the principle, and deposed Queen Elizabeth; and it was also to be found in a decree by Boniface VIII., and in a bull of Leo X., renewing and approving the constitution of Boniface VIII., in General Council. Now, the most infallible thing with a Roman Catholic was a General Council and a Pope at its head. The Italian said that the Pope was infallible, the French said it was the General Council; but Cardinal Wiseman said that it was both together. Yet both together had decided that the civil power must be subjected to the spiritual power. Now either the Church of Rome, as represented by her Popes and Councils, had erred, and proved herself fallible, or Dr. Wiseman must hold out that Queen Victoria's sceptre was subject to his crozier. (Hear.) Let him take which horn of the dilemma he pleased. If he would not pitch upon one, he (Dr. Cumming) would throw him upon the other. (Loud cheers.) The Cardinal had stated that one reason why he required the constitution of the Papal hierarchy in England was, that the canon law could not be set up here under the vicar apostolic; which implied, in fact, that the canon law, which authorised and commanded the extermination of heretics, was now to be set up in this country by the Cardinal. The canon law also laid it down that oaths which might be considered contrary to the utility of the Romish Church were not to be observed. Also, if the secular power refused to exterminate errors within a year, let it be told to the Sovereign Pontiff, and let him release the subjects of that power from their fealty, and give the country to Catholics; who, after exterminating the heretics, shall remain and enjoy it themselves. (Laughter, and "Oh, oh.") Such was a portion only of that canon law, which was now to be set up in England, under the auspices of Cardinal Wiseman; but which, when set up, would be soon set down again. (Loud cheers.) In his manifesto, as it was termed, Dr. Wiseman said that the royal supremacy was not admitted by the Scotch Church, the Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or Methodists. First, he said the Scotch Church did not admit the Queen's supremacy. And here he had proved himself most fallible; for the Queen or her representative must sit on the throne in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Now, if that Church passed a law which touched her supremacy, what then was done? They were brought to account, and made to keep within their own bounds. (Hear, hear.) He said next that the Dissenters did not admit the Queen's supremacy. Well, but if they did not, neither did they admit the supremacy of any foreign prince or potentate. (Loud cheers.) If the civil power trampled upon the rights of the Independents or the Wesleyans, they would complain—they would ask redress. If they could not obtain it, they would suffer. But if the civil power trenchon the rights of Cardinal Wiseman, the Pope would absolve the subjects of the Queen, and release them from their fealty. There, then, was a broad, a very broad distinction. (Cheers.) Again, the Dissenting minister did not preach in a chapel without a license from the Queen to preach there; but Cardinal Wiseman parcelled out whole dioceses in the Queen's dominions, and ruled them without a license from any one except the Pope. (Hear.) When the Cardinal issued his pastoral, he stated in it, that at present, and until such time as the Holy See should see fit, he governed, and should continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Hertford. Now, if he had wanted spiritual jurisdiction only, he would have said, "we shall teach, and shall continue to teach, the Roman Catholics" in those counties. But no, that did not satisfy him. He would be content with nothing short of "government." (Hear, hear.) The other day he saw a statement quoted from the *Dumfries Courier*, in an able article in the *Morning Herald* upon this subject, to the effect that Dr. Gillies had declared that, if the appointment now made should be reversed, the Catholic powers of Europe would interfere and take care to prevent it. (Tremendous groans and hisses.) He (Dr. Cumming) was ashamed of the Scotchman who, though he might be a Papist, could go into the pulpit and make such a declaration as that. (Cheers.) Surely the Pope had quite enough to do just now to keep himself in his own seat. (Loud cheers.) The common notion which was abroad, that Cardinal Wiseman merely governed the "faithful," or the Roman Catholics, was incorrect, and might be seen to be so on reference to Liguori, who stated that the bishop was bound to purge his diocese of heretics. Dr. Cumming then proceeded to ask what had been the fruits of Romanism in those countries over which it had exercised the most complete [sway, and read an

eloquent passage from Mr. Macaulay's "History of England," in which the degraded and miserable condition of countries like Italy, Portugal, and Ireland is contrasted with the highly-civilised and prosperous countries of England and Scotland, and a beautiful and favourable picture is drawn of the superiority of Protestant over Roman Catholic nations. In bringing his remarks to a close, Dr. Cumming said that the charge against Cardinal Wiseman was not that he had been teaching as a vicar apostolical certain dogmas, but that he had brought with him the missive of a foreign prince assuming power and jurisdiction in the land; and that from Westminster, as from a Popish fountain, he would spread and diffuse principles which must delude the loyalty of the Roman Catholics themselves in proportion as they embraced them, and impair that homage which was due to the Queen as the head of the nation, and which she deserved as the noblest, purest, and best beloved Sovereign that had ever swayed a sceptre. (Cheers.) If we were to give spiritual allegiance to any body, let it be to some one within the realm, who was a subject of the Queen, and not to a potentate without it, who was neither subject nor loyal. (Cheers.) He had no fear respecting the ultimate issue of this question. Let us be inspired by pure religion and Bible principles, and he was certain that the present excitement would never plunge us into excess, but we should do that which was loyal and became us as subjects, and that which was right and became us as Christians. (Loud cheers.) "Hate not the error," proceeded Dr. Cumming, "so much as you love the truth. Do not forget, in your detestation of the cardinal's hat, that an immortal soul is under it, which needs to be saved. Love the poor misguided victim, but protest against his principles. Pray against their spread. Petition the Throne and Parliament; and speak what you feel and know. We are at the commencement of a great crisis. The thin end of the wedge has been introduced. (Hear, hear.) Let us make that protest, and have that Protestantism which has all the fixity of an everlasting principle, and all the fervour of an undying passion. (Loud cheers.) Let us not look behind to see what numbers follow to encourage us—let us not look before, to see what numbers may be opposed to us, to frighten us. If we are told, as Luther was once told, 'Luther, the whole world is against you,' let our noble reply be, 'Then we, England, will be against the whole world.' (Vehement cheering.) Let yours be that Protestantism which in little things is yielding as the ozier-bough, but which in this and all great things is like the old British oak, which grows on old British soil, its gnarled roots interwoven with the everlasting rocks, its proud head raised careless whether the storm-cloud bursts over it, or the sunshine smile upon it, and equally prepared to overcome the one or to be refreshed by the other. If this be our Protestantism, then all the bulls the Cardinal can bring from the arsenals of Rome shall be inoperative, and all the weapons which Jesuits can wield against it shall lie in splinters at its glorious roots, or hang upon its branches, memorials of the Pope's impotence, and trophies of England's strength, the stability of the Throne, and the glory of our common country. (The reverend gentleman concluded his lecture amidst a succession of the most boisterous and deafening volleys of cheering.)

"God save the Queen" was then sung by the audience with a right loyal and enthusiastic spirit, and the proceedings terminated.

[It is with some degree of reluctance and doubt that we print Dr. Cumming's lecture. There is throughout this and the previous lecture such an imitation of the excitements of platform discussions, such a tendency to disturb the imaginations and passions of the thoughtless portion of the multitude, that we fear the Rev. Doctor's lucubrations are not calculated to aid in bringing about a reasonable solution of the various important matters now in dispute, arising out of the recent "Papal Aggression." Giving the Rev. Dr. Cumming credit for the best intentions, still there is, like his prototype, the late Rev. Edward Irving, far too much of the result of the bewildering wanderings among fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecies in most of what the Rev. Doctor writes and says, that we fear to be led by his dicta, and are compelled to hope that his end may not be like his once celebrated predecessor.

It is impossible for the Editor of these pamphlets to depict, in proper terms, his opinion on the serious and important question at issue in the "Roman Catholic Question;" still he cannot help expressing his conviction that all good men should endeavour to bring their thoughts and actions to bear upon the various spiritual and temporal interests involved in the questions now in contention, more in accordance with the good examples of Apostolic times; endeavouring to imitate the combined human and divine examples of our Saviour—and whilst emulating the teaching power and decisions of St. Peter—the impetuous zeal and heavenly advice of St. Paul—not to forget to reflect on the doubts and convictions of St. Thomas—in the facts and arguments they may either advance themselves or listen to from others. To a thoughtful mind it is a serious reflection how much sin is now being committed in this country through the heated debates of the platform and lecture-room, and the painfully reasoned articles of too many of the public prints. The excitements of these times have a strong tendency to give vent to the worst passions of human nature; if a well-constituted Christian mind would only calmly and deliberately reflect on the immoral tendencies to the multitude of the processions of "guys" in our streets, the burning of Popes and Cardinals in our fields, the ribaldry of pictures, the profane language of literary squibs—if, we say, the good and thoughtful of our countrymen would seriously think on the tendency to blasphemy and irreligion of these things, they could not fail to see not only how much of an unchristian spirit is mixed up with them, but that, to a considerable extent, the same influences which are now too much at work in our beloved country, are almost identical with those which led to the crucifixion of our Lord and Saviour, eighteen hundred years ago; and it is a fearful and awful thing to think on and assert, that these influences must, if not discouraged in time by the good of the land, tend to bring about a dreadful relapse against the "established," or any other kind of religion in this kingdom.

The personal experiences of the Editor of these pamphlets justify him in stating, without reference to names of persons or places, that a fearful amount of blasphemy, irreverence, and crime has been evidenced as the result of too many of the recent assemblings; and a multitude of communications he has received from all parts of the country assure him that many apparently respectable persons, including even ministers of religion, have been quiet observers of its evil propensities. Finally, he trusts these remarks will be received, as they are intended, in a kindly, and, he trusts, a Christian spirit.

Communications for the Editor are solicited; to be addressed for him at 49, Paternoster-row.]

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND LORD J. RUSSELL.

TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

MY LORD,—The prominent part which it has seemed good to your lordship to adopt on the occasion of the present outcry against the Roman Catholics of England and the head of their Church, and the not unnatural effect which this has produced in exasperating religious excitement throughout the country, must be deemed, I think, sufficient to justify a few words from one involved in your lordship's denunciation.

You lordship terms what you are pleased to call the Pope's aggression upon Protestantism as "insolent" and "insidious." If the Pope, as the sovereign of a comparatively petty kingdom in Italy, had, as such, either in word or deed, committed an aggression on the mighty and colossal power of Great Britain, or on the gracious Sovereign who holds undisputed sway over the temporal destinies of this mighty empire, then, indeed, your lordship's epithet would not have been misapplied.

But, my lord, the act of his Holiness bears nothing of this character. The power which he claims is not of this world—affects no temporal sovereignty. As successor of St. Peter, and invested as such with his commission from the Divine founder of our religion, the authority which the Pope claims is wholly of a spiritual character. As such he inherits a jurisdiction as distinct from as it is unaccountable to human power. It prevailed in spite of the mighty power of the Roman empire; it extended its sway over the many kingdoms into which that empire was divided; it was recognised undisputed for centuries in this country by our Catholic ancestors, until that bad and despotic monarch, whose will no laws, human or divine, could control, consummated his claim to supremacy at the expense of the noblest and best blood of his subjects.

Still, my lord, through three centuries of persecution, a remnant—small, indeed, but faithful—of the inhabitants of Great Britain has retained that spiritual allegiance to the see of Rome which is recognised by the vast majority of the Christian world, and which is as distinct from the temporal allegiance due to our Sovereign as human affairs are distinct from spiritual, temporal from eternal.

Your lordship must be well aware that this distinction between the temporal and spiritual jurisdiction of their Sovereign and the head of their religion was the sole bar which excluded our Catholic ancestors, and many of ourselves, for several years, from the political rights and privileges of our fellow-subjects.

Your lordship may probably remember that concise but clear reply of a Roman Catholic at the table of the House of Commons when presented with the then unamended oath of allegiance:—"I cannot take this oath, because it contains one assertion which I know to be false, and another which I believe to be so." Catholic emancipation followed, and recognised, if not by word at least by implication, that the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope was acknowledged by a large body of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom.

Such then, my lord, is the spiritual jurisdiction, claiming institution from God himself, the exercise of which through eighteen centuries your lordship is now pleased to designate "insolent." Your lordship also adds "insidious." How far this epithet, too, is consistent with the charge of detailed and explicit boldness of a document which, in the eyes of many, forms its chief offence, I must leave to your lordship to explain.

The real question, then, now at issue is, whether virtually, as regards British Roman Catholics (for an exception seems to be drawn between us and all other Roman Catholic subjects of her Majesty), the Emancipation Act, regarding the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope, is to be admitted or not—whether it can be, by being "carefully examined," to use your lordship's words, set aside? And what is the special ground of this threat of renewed penal laws? Why, the exercise of a power of appointing bishops is as old as the see of Rome itself; it is, and must be, inherent in our religion; and though, as a temporary expedient, the Pope may and has appointed his own vicars, dependant upon and removable at his own pleasure, as was lately the case in this country, yet such is neither the ordinary course of the discipline of the Church, nor consistent with the exercise of rights enjoyed by all other considerable bodies of its members. Surely the distinction is sufficiently clear between our bishops and clergy in communion with the see of Rome and the bishops and clergy of the Established Church, as appointed by the Queen, for no mistake to arise either on the subject of the source of their

power, or on the mode of its exercise. There can be no doubt that whilst we, as Roman Catholics, pay all due deference to the law, in acknowledging the temporal claims and rights of the latter, we do and must repudiate their spiritual authority, or we must renounce our religion; nor can I see how or why these latter should fear any spiritual infringement or any rival jurisdiction from bishops, nominees of a pontiff whom they have denounced as Antichrist, and members of a Church which they have solemnly called God to witness they believed to be involved in blasphemous idolatry.

No, my lord, there cannot be, nor ought there to be, any mistake here. God forbid, indeed, that so awful a denunciation should be made by me against any body of Christians, however much I may and do differ from their religious opinions, which I hope and believe many conscientiously entertain as truth; but surely the precaution which the law has provided against retaining similar titles, and by which the Pope in his late nomination carefully abided, ought to prove sufficiently that the respective claimants to episcopal jurisdiction are as distinct and recognisable as the religions which they profess.

I cannot conclude, my lord, without an expression of my surprise and regret that your lordship's name should be identified with a renewal of a cry against the rights of conscience. Those who saw with regret the repeal of the penal laws which had so long oppressed your Catholic fellow-countrymen will indeed rejoice to have the Prime Minister of England re-echoing their long-cherished but almost forgotten cry, and that that Minister should be Lord John Russell. Still I cannot but think well enough of the great majority of those who welcomed the great measure carried by that eminent man, now, alas, lost to his country and to us, to feel convinced that the simple fulfilment of a sacred duty by the head of the Roman Catholic Church, in the restoration in this country of our ordinary ecclesiastical superiors, will be considered, as it ought to be, only the fulfilment of a sacred duty, to which he is bound by the position in which it has pleased Providence to place him, and to which we, the Roman Catholics of England, have as just and as unobjectionable a claim as our fellow-subjects in Ireland, in the colonies, or as other equally numerous bodies of Roman Catholics in every quarter of the globe.

One word, my lord, more on the use which you would make of a name dear to the affections of every Englishman. I will not believe that your lordship has ventured to traduce the loyalty of British Catholics to their Queen, or that our gracious Sovereign would consider otherwise than an abuse of confidence a whisper that would breathe a suspicion against the devoted attachment of her English Roman Catholic subjects. Such things have indeed occurred when Ministers of State have allowed religious feelings to embitter the administration of affairs committed to their charge. I will not, however, stop to reply to what I cannot but believe our gracious Sovereign would consider an insult to herself.

No, happen what may from your lordship's "careful examination of the present state of the law," or from "your deliberate consideration of the propriety of adopting any proceedings," the English Catholics will never believe their Queen is a willing party to the violation of the rights of conscience. Her Majesty may, indeed—as she has done upon one, to her, we believe, most painful occasion—under the rigid enactment of the law, in the presence and under the example of the assembled nobles of the land, at the exhortation and presentation of the Archbishops and Bishops of her Church, give a constitutional assent to what is most foreign to her heart; but, be the result what it may—proscription of property or loss of life—the English Catholic will, I trust, know how, in imitation of his ancestors, to meet whatever may occur in support of his religion. That religion will enjoin him a duty, equally just in itself as it is grateful to his feelings—undeviating attachment to the amiable and virtuous lady in whom it has pleased Providence to bless the inhabitants of the British empire.

I have the honour to remain, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obedient Servant,

CHARLES LANGDALE.

Houghton, Nov. 15, 1850.

THE BIRMINGHAM ADDRESS.

On November the 18th an influential meeting of the Roman Catholics of this town was held at Birmingham in the hall attached to the Bishop's house, for the purpose of considering the propriety of adopting an address to the inhabitants of the town relative to the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Amongst those present were the Rev. Dr. Weedall, Dr. J. H. Newman, G. Jeffries, B. Ivers, T. Lieth, Ambrose St. John, Bowles, O'Niel, Darnell, and Mills; and Messrs. Wareing, Bretherton, Hardman, Fletcher, Tidmarsh, Bishop, Powell, Smith, Souter, J. Cooper, Summerfield, Carrol, Arch, Pevrelle, Sheath, Kelly, Nock, Holdcroft, Lloyd, &c.

At 11 o'clock, the Very Rev. Dr. WEEDALL having been called to the chair, that gentleman opened the business by a brief address.

Dr. NEWMAN said, he considered it extremely kind and complimentary to have intrusted to him the resolution he held in his hand. It was simply one of congratulation, in the sentiments of which he entirely concurred—"That the following address from the Catholics of the town be presented to the inhabitants of Birmingham :"—

"A moral persecution is now raised against the religious liberties of the Catholics of England, and great efforts are made, not only by a considerable portion of the press, but also by dignitaries and clergy of the Establishment, through appeals to the passions and prejudices of men, to inflame the public mind, and induce the Government to re-enact penal statutes against us.

"This persecution strikes at the very root of our religious liberties, both as Englishmen and as Catholics. The principles upon which these appeals to the passions are based strike with equal force against the religious liberty of the Catholics of the other nations of the United Kingdom, and even of the whole British Empire.

"The Catholic subjects of her Majesty constitute one-third of the inhabitants of these realms; they are fully as numerous as the *bonâ fide* members either of the Establishment or of any other communion, and they constitute a vast proportion of the Christian population of the whole Empire.

"The real question involved in this agitation is—Shall the Catholics of the British Empire live and breathe in the free exercise of their religion, or not? Shall religious liberty continue to be the principle by which the spirit of our country is ruled and on which the law is administered?

"The case stands thus—We cannot live as Catholics without the elements essential to our religion. Amongst the most essential elements are—an ecclesiastical government by bishops of our own, and the guidance of the head of our Church. Without these we are no longer Catholics; just as the Church of England would no longer be the Church of England without its bishops and its head.

"It is essential to the very idea of a bishop that he have a title derived from some locality that may constitute the centre of his communications with his flock. Where there is more than one bishop in a kingdom, there must be a division of territory; or neither could know the members of his flock from those of another's, nor could either exercise distinct jurisdiction over his people. This is common sense, as well as canon law. The English Catholics claim their right of having their own bishops—bishops known to them as their own by a local tie, and whom they may recognise as English bishops of English Catholics, by titles taken from places in the country of their own homes.

"If hitherto, and for a long time past, they have had bishops holding their titles 'in partibus infidelium,' it was because the Pope in reality exercised the jurisdiction of immediate bishop in England, and the local bishops exercised their functions not as English bishops, but as Vicars Apostolic of his Holiness.

"But this was an anomalous state, and not the permanent order of things. It was established when we were under persecution, and is not the ordinary condition of our Church, such as exists, and always has existed, in Ireland, and is established in her Majesty's colonies and foreign possessions, and in every Catholic country.

"The great increase in the numbers of English and Irish Catholics which has taken place in this country has made it requisite that a larger number of bishops should be created, and that they should have their sees in this country. We violate no law known by having bishops of our own; and, independently of human law, we have inherent right to whatever benefits we require from their jurisdiction and spiritual functions.

"Besides this, our original indefeasible right, the Emancipation Act of 1829 left the adoption of this measure open to us, by setting us at liberty to exercise our religion in full freedom, with the exception that the use of certain episcopal titles, specified in the act, was prohibited; which enactment has been respected, and those titles not taken. Hence, if a restriction were now made in the liberties recognised and secured to us by that act, it would bear a character of severity alien from the spirit of the constitution. In fact, it would be a condemnation upon us for availing ourselves of the benefits of that act, while paying, at the same time, a deference to its prohibitions.

"As Roman Catholics, our bishops cannot be appointed without the authorisation of the head of our Church. The bishoprics of our Church can no more be regulated without the intervention of our head than the bishoprics of the Church of England without their head. The law admits that we have the Pope for our head, and leaves us at liberty, by the Emancipation Act, to acknowledge him openly as our head.

"His Holiness continually nominates Catholic bishops in Ireland; a hierarchy has also recently been established in the Australian colonies; and in all these cases the Government has directed their titles of honour to be given to the bishops, and has recognised their episcopal character in acts of Parliament. All these bishops are well-known to derive their titles from localities over which they preside within the Queen's dominions. Are we, as Englishmen, entitled to less liberty and to fewer religious rights than our brethren in Ireland and in the colonies?

"As the late appointment of our bishops has been made solely for spiritual purposes, and has conferred on them solely spiritual powers, it is most untrue that in that appointment the head of

our Church has in any way attacked the Established Church or the prerogatives of our beloved Sovereign, or encroached upon the liberties, whether civil or ecclesiastical, of the realm; nor have we by this measure laid claim to any rights over the Protestant establishment, nor interfered with any right or privilege of a single individual who is not a member of our Church.

"The laws abrogated by his Holiness are our own Catholic ecclesiastical laws, laws which have emanated either from the Holy See or the authorities of our Church in this country—those by which we as Catholics are governed by our own ecclesiastical superiors in our own ecclesiastical affairs. There has been no interference with any law of the State or of the Establishment as such.

"What his Holiness has done is to appoint bishops to preside over us in certain sees, to resign into their hands a portion of the power over us as Catholics, of which he has hitherto retained the exercise in his own, and to leave us free from the obligations of certain ecclesiastical laws which might otherwise have embarrassed the spiritual administration of our Church.

"Our loyalty to our Sovereign is unimpeachable. None of her Majesty's subjects have given greater proofs of their loyalty than the Catholics of England. We have often declared, and again we declare, that we have no temporal Sovereign but our Queen, to whom, and to the constitution of our country, we are loyally and devotedly attached.

"We claim the right to regulate our own religious concerns as independently of the headship of the Church of England as any other communion which does not acknowledge that head; and we cannot but feel that the religious liberties of all our countrymen are bound up with our own; and that an attack upon our religious arrangements strikes equally at the liberty of every subject in the British empire.

"We equally feel that the passions of the multitude, once stirred up against the Catholic Episcopacy, may easily be turned against every other ecclesiastical authority; and that the weapons of misrepresentation, of ridicule, and of sarcasm, whilst they are aimed at us, may have their rebound against all religious institutions and all sacred things.

"We beg to offer to you this explanation of the recent measure of the establishment of our hierarchy, in the hope that, as we have hitherto lived amongst you in the peaceable enjoyment of our religious liberties without giving occasion of offence by interference in the concerns of others, you will not now be induced to join in the outcry by which our rights and privileges are at present assailed."

The rev. gentleman, in continuation, said the address especially alluded to the power and fair scope which the bishops and clergy would have under the new arrangement, but nobody could think that it meant more than scope in spiritual matters. It was not their intention to interfere with others, to exert any improper influence or temporal power directly or indirectly over any one. He believed conscientiously they were right, in a proper position, and could not but wish their friends and neighbours to be in the same; but other than purely legitimate means they never contemplated using towards any one. He thought the Catholic Church in England stood in need of the episcopal arrangements which had recently been made; and the Pope having placed their bishop there amongst them, they might be as certain as they were of the truth of the Church that he would be supported by the Almighty. (Hear, hear.) He would have grace given him to discharge the duties of his office, and whatever difficulties he and they might have to encounter would turn to their advantage. The present outcry could not do them harm. They had only to be true to themselves and rally round their bishop, and all difficulties would be solved. If their enemies should be sufficiently strong to persecute them, to put them in prison, they knew all would be unavailing—that persecution never succeeded. Let them,

therefore, go forth confidently, seriously, firmly, and patiently throw themselves unreservedly
 God, and trust to his Providence for the issue. (Applause.)

A ROMAN CATHOLIC EXPLANATION OF THE PAPAL AGGRESSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."*

SIR,—I am no admirer of Cardinal Wiseman. But let us be just, nevertheless, to others. The Catholics of England are not to be condemned because Dr. Wiseman is ambitious; nor are they whose lives have been spent in respectful submission to the laws to be branded as disloyal because he has chosen to do an innocent act in a very offensive and reprehensible manner.

I call it an innocent act—innoent, I mean, as regards the laws and people of this country—for in itself, and as an act of ecclesiastical polity, the restoration of canonical discipline in their own body can be regarded by Catholics only as a wise and necessary measure. Its wisdom,

* We purposely erase from this letter the numerous extraordinary invectives against the Cardinal, as they evidently have their origin in strong vindictive feeling and personal spite.

however, or its necessity, is not the concern of the nation. The people can look only at the manner in which it affects themselves and their institutions; and if I succeed in showing that neither in its object nor in its working is it calculated to offend against either, I think that I shall have done something towards allaying that bitterness of feeling which is now so widely spreading through the land. Let us look at the facts.

By the canons of the Church, as well as by the appointment of its Divine Founder, bishops possess an independent authority to govern the people committed to their spiritual charge. Their power is original, not delegated. They derive it from their office, they hold it subject to no power of revocation, and they exercise it, not only in a general care and supervision of their subjects, but also in framing such laws and regulations as may tend to their spiritual advantage. They are elected by the clergy; and the clergy, in turn, are governed and presided over by them; but, at the same time, these are invested with such an appropriate share of independence as effectually secures them against any arbitrary or oppressive measures on the part of their superiors. Of such bishops, and of such a clergy, the Catholics were deprived by the change of religion under Elizabeth. At the same time, deceived by the intrigues and the misrepresentations of certain members of the Catholic body, the Pope, when applied to, hesitated to restore what had thus been lost: he assumed to himself the character and the office of their immediate bishop; and by means of his own vicars, men selected by himself, revocable at will, amenable to him for every act, and compelled to have recourse to him in every emergency, continued to direct the spiritual concerns of the Catholics in this kingdom. To the inconveniences of such a system the vicars themselves could scarcely have been insensible. But the clergy had the strongest ground of complaint. Holding no acknowledged position, possessing no canonical rights, they had no appeal if they were injured, no remedy if they were unjustly deprived. Their superior was a man in whose selection they had had no voice, with whose person they were, perhaps, unacquainted. As he was not bound to provide them with employment, so neither was he bound to retain them in the service to which they had dedicated their lives. He might discard them without a reason; he might deprive them of their incumbencies without a cause; he might arbitrarily, and at a moment's notice, remove them from place to place, break up the growing association between themselves and their flocks, and effectually destroy whatever interest they might feel in the improvement or preservation of their missions. So common and so well understood was this last proceeding, that one of the best and most venerated of those spiritual delegates used commonly to say that the clergy should regard themselves as soldiers under marching orders, ready to move, and prepared to obey the command of their general, at any moment.

Here, then, we behold the real origin and object of the recent measure at Rome. Wearing by the inconveniences, and disgusted by the oppressive anomalies, of their position, the clergy had again and again petitioned to be placed on a canonical footing. For a time, the vicars themselves steadily resisted the application, and foiled every effort that was made to insure its success. Dr. Wiseman resolutely opposed it; he is even said to have written against it in the *Dublin Review*. Still the clergy persevered. From the north and from the south petitions went up to Rome, stating their grievances, complaining of the hardship of their condition, and imploring the Supreme Pastor to place them once more in the rank of a canonical body. A better time seemed to approach. Better counsels began to prevail, and more enlightened views to be taken by the vicars. Those prelates were at last induced to espouse the cause, and it was at length understood that they had engaged to negotiate the matter with Rome. This was in 1846. In 1847 the negotiation was believed to have succeeded, for Dr. Wiseman in that year assured the clergy that Dr. Walsh was actually appointed to the see of Westminster, and himself to that of Birmingham. This, however, we know was not the fact. "Another bishop," says Dr. Ullathorne, "was delegated in 1848 with still more earnest petitions" for the establishment of a canonical form of government. That bishop was Dr. Ullathorne himself. He brought the matter to a prosperous issue; and if the arrangements were not then carried out, it was only because "the troubles which befel the Roman States put a temporary bar to its completion." What was then, however, suspended has now been perfected. The vicars have been converted into bishops, the agents and delegates into independent principals. The Pope, a foreigner, and of all foreigners the most dreaded in this country, has resigned the office of our bishop, and thirteen prelates, men selected from amongst ourselves, and chosen by the voices of Englishmen, are destined henceforth to preside over us. They are no longer the ministers of a foreign see. Their revocable character has been annulled, their original jurisdiction established. The powers of the Roman Pontiff are reduced within the strict limits of the canons; while the clergy, it is to be hoped, will share the privileges thus extended to their superiors, and be placed on a footing of rational and canonical independence.

Such, then, is the simple history, the cause, the origin, the object, and the nature of a measure which, however misunderstood by the people of this country, is assuredly as innocent in its intention as it is useful to the body for whose spiritual benefit it has been contrived. To the nation generally it has no reference. It neither meditates aggression nor conceals a plot. There is no mystery behind. It is a simple remedy to acknowledged evils, a tardy concession to complaints of ancient date, a relief from grievances which have long and fatally weighed upon the clergy. Had it been adopted in 1847, it would never have been heard of

beyond the precincts of Catholics; had it been brought silently into operation, its effects and its existence, as far as Protestants were concerned, would have been alike unknown.

After what I have said of the nature and object of the late measure, it may scarcely seem necessary to speak of what has been called the "territorial division" of the kingdom. It may be observed that it contemplates Catholic objects and Catholic purposes only; and, consequently, that the power of government which it claims has no more to do with the Protestants of England than with the subjects of the Emperor of China. As to the former—the territorial division of the kingdom—what is it when divested of the mysterious garb in which it has been exhibited to the world? There is no novelty in the proceeding, and I if no novelty, certainly no danger. The country was so divided in 1688; it was again divided in 1840. The separate parts were then called "vicariates," their rulers "vicars." The former are now denominated "bishoprics," and the latter "bishops." As regards the Protestant portion of the kingdom, there has been a change of name, and nothing more—a change which affects exclusively the spiritual subjects of our own Church.

Nor let it be argued that by thus assuming a local designation for our bishops, insult is either offered or implied to the ecclesiastical establishment of the country. An English Catholic is surely not less free in the exercise and enjoyment of his religion than his Irish brethren. In Ireland, "a territorial hierarchy," as it is called, has ever existed side by side with the bishoprics of the Established Church. It has been acknowledged by the country; it has been recognised by the laws; it has been honoured by the Sovereign. With this example before them must English Catholics be charged with "insolence" and "insult" for claiming a similar privilege within the law?

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A CATHOLIC.

CARDINAL WISEMAN.

From the "Daily News," Nov. 15, 1850.

Cardinal Wiseman and his *soi-disant* suffragans have incurred the penalties of *præmunire*. The phrase is in everybody's mouth: what precisely does it mean?

The origin and growth of that portion of our statute law which, previous to the Reformation, constituted the main defence of king and people against the encroachments of the Papacy is not very difficult to trace. Rome during the reigns of the Plantagenets was at the zenith of its political power. Nearly the whole of Western Christendom owned its spiritual suzerainty. Emperors and kings, free cities and fierce barons, held in turn the stirrup of its ambition. The net-work of its subtle polity was spread over all lands; and feudalism itself bent beneath the weight of its authority. As feuds were held of the Crown, so kingdoms were disposed of by the arrogant successors of St. Peter. Henry II. did not disdain to accept the lordship of Ireland as a gift from Adrian, and his son was not ashamed to execute a formal surrender of the crown to Innocent III., and to receive it again at a rent of 1,000 marks a year! Ecclesiastical courts asserted an absolute independence of civil control, and claimed for all persons in holy orders exemption from all responsibility save to their peculiar jurisdiction. Vast wealth became accumulated in the hands of the regular and secular clergy. Landed property was every year to a greater extent inclosed within the impenetrable fence of mortmain. Finally, the benefices and bishoprics of the National Church were grasped at by the insatiable cupidity of Rome.

The spirit of the nation, which had complacently endured every other species of indignity and encroachment, revolted against this new usurpation. In the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Edward I., a statute was passed which Coke declares to be the foundation of that edifice of ecclesiastical liberty eventually perfected by such gradual care and raised to such a noble and conspicuous elevation. The provisions of this early act, however, proved ineffectual for their purpose; and one of the weighty charges against the ill-fated Edward II. was his allowing of Bulls from Rome to be brought into the kingdom for the unlawful disposal of Church preferments, and the like. His successor strove at the beginning of his reign to induce the Papal Court to come to some reasonable understanding. But his expostulations seemed only to provoke fresh ebullitions of insolence; and in reply to his remonstrances he was reminded that France had recently humbled herself before the universal lord of nations, and that the Emperor of Germany was equally submissive. Edward III. replied, as became him, that though every Prince and State should league together to maintain this scheme of usurpation, he and his people were resolved to vindicate the ancient freedom of the realm. Nor was this an idle boast. Several acts were passed declaring all presentments made by Rome to livings or bishoprics, and all pretended acts collating persons to other benefices, void, and rendering those who should procure or accept any such appointments liable to fine and imprisonment.

In the following reign the law was rendered still more stringent; special provisions were introduced against the holding of any ecclesiastical preferment by aliens, or persons born out of the legiance of the King; and all liege men of the Crown accepting benefices by "foreign provision" were put out of the protection of the law. These enactments were denounced at Rome as impious and schismatical, and threats of excommunication were hurled against those

who should presume to execute or obey them. But the Parliaments of those days were of one mind on the subject; and by the 16th Richard II., ch. 5, they not only re-affirmed the most important principles embodied in former statutes, but further enacted that whoever should "procure at Rome any bulls, processes, excommunications, instruments, or other things, which touch the King, against his crown and realm, and all persons aiding and assisting therein, should be put out of the King's protection, their lands and goods forfeited; and that they should be attached by their bodies to the King and his council, or process of *præmunire facias* should be made out against them."

This last-recited act is generally called "the Statute of *Præmunire*," from the title of the writ under which proceedings were taken against its violators. From the resolute unanimity with which its policy was sustained by the nation, no efforts on the part of the Italian priesthood were able to defeat it. In vain Pope Eugenius assumed the right to appoint a bishop to fill the see of Ely; the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to consecrate him, and another was duly enthroned, whom the chapter had chosen and the King approved. In vain Martin V. commanded the archbishop to endeavour to obtain the repeal of the 16th Richard II.,—*that excommunicatum*, as he called it; and upon the refusal of the primate, affected to suspend him from his functions. The University of Oxford, both Houses of Parliament, and the Sovereign, each sent embassies to deprecate the pontiff's wrath; and the struggle was allowed to die away.

In Tudor times, many stringent laws were passed, securing the royal supremacy. The most important, perhaps, was the 5th Elizabeth, chap. 1, by which to maintain the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome within the realm was made an offence, punishable as in cases of *præmunire* the first time, and as in cases of high treason for the second. This was followed by many others framed in a like spirit for the enforcement of uniformity in public worship, &c. And though in our days these enactments have always been treated as practically obsolete, it was not without reiterated discussion during three successive sessions of 1844, 1845, and 1846, that Lord Lyndhurst and Sir James Graham were able to prevail on Parliament to abrogate formally the barbarous penalties already mentioned. The ancient statutes themselves were suffered to remain unrepealed, as landmarks of the national polity; and the friends of toleration were glad to see their excessive and impracticable severities done away.

The Emancipation Act of 1829 in no respect removed or lessened the force of those disqualifying statutes whereby Roman Catholics are rendered incapable of holding preferments in the established Church either of England, Scotland, or Ireland. On the contrary, the 16th section explicitly recognises and re-enacts, in the most comprehensive terms, the disabilities in that behalf existing. Nothing that has since been done by Parliament tends to weaken that exclusion. Episcopal and capitular revenues, tithes and offerings, fines, dues, and perquisites, to the uttermost farthing remain secure. And the Sovereign of these realms might still exclaim, in the language of her remote ancestor, six centuries ago, "No foreign priest shall tythe or toll in my dominions."

Then, as to ecclesiastical titles; the wide distinction ought to be borne in mind between those which imply and are plainly intended to assert territorial jurisdiction, and those which are but prefixes of respect and courtesy to the names of individuals. Everybody knew, for example, that during the last seven years Dr. Wiseman was called by his friends and adherents "Bishop;" and nobody cared to dispute his claim to that appellation. It implied no usurpation of any other person's office. It gave no just cause of offence, therefore, to anyone. Neither would any sane or sober-minded Protestant have troubled himself to inquire why the Roman Catholic priesthood, who considered Dr. Wiseman as their spiritual chief, had chosen to give him the novel title of archbishop, the Pope consenting thereto. All these matters were, strictly speaking, affairs with which the nation at large had nothing whatever to do, and in which, consequently, they were not likely to have ever dreamt of intermeddling. But the case is wholly different when Pius IX., a foreign sovereign, publicly pretends by his own authority, and of his own will, to create a new territorial dignity within the realm, to append thereto a definite and specific territorial jurisdiction, and to confer this territorial title and territorial jurisdiction. Dr. Wiseman is not in the position of a Roman priest elected by his brethren to preside over them in Westminster. He claims to be, by the nomination and appointment of an Italian prince, metropolitan archbishop of England. This is the cause of offence, not the assumption of the clerical style and title of any particular rank or degree.

"A MONSTER LIE! CARDINAL WISEMAN."

(From the "British Banner" of 20th November, 1850.)

Never is falsehood more contemptible and odious than when it has become mingled with truth, and found a place in endeavours to support the greatest of all causes—the cause of God among men. Such, however, is human nature, and such the difficulty, where millions are talking, and the multitudes are writing, to preserve, in all cases, truth without mixture; and hence it is only to be expected that, occasionally, grievous misrepresentations will creep into

public discussions. Of these we have the means of correcting one, and, in our estimation, a very serious one. Opposed as we are, heart and soul, to Popery, and to Cardinal Wiseman as its chief type and representative in these realms, yet far be it from us, in the slightest conceivable degree, no matter how indirectly, to aid the propagation of a falsehood, which is calculated most materially to damage him. We have, therefore, the utmost pleasure in giving currency to the following correspondence :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BRITISH BANNER."

"SIR,—Seeing a report in your paper, copied from the *Daily News*, charging Dr. Wiseman with a piece of glaring fraud, I wrote him on the subject, telling him I was a Protestant, but hated misrepresentation, and would contradict the report if I could do it. He this morning sent me a letter, a copy of which I send you; and as it is most candid and satisfactory, you will oblige me, and do an act of justice, by giving it an early insertion in the *Banner*, or so much of it as will set the Doctor right.—Yours faithfully,

"*Sittingbourne, Nov. 16, 1850.*

"JOHN DEAN.

"P.S.—I have read every Number of the *Banner*, and taken it from the commencement."

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S REPLY TO MR. DEAN.

"*St. George's, Southwark, Nov. 15, 1850.*

"SIR,—I am much obliged to you for your manly and straightforward application to me. Had the same feelings animated others as you display, much misunderstanding would have been avoided, and much clamour spared. You will, doubtless, be surprised to hear that I never in my life saw, nor spoke to, nor corresponded with, the late Mr. Taylor, of Weybridge; that he died before I came to London; nor had any connexion with the Catholic Church here, and that I am not named in his will.

"Since coming to London, I have had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of his excellent family, have visited them at Weybridge, where they are kind enough to receive me at any time, and am on terms of perfect good understanding with Mr. James Taylor, the supposed disinherited son, who, with his sister, enjoys every farthing of his father's property. He has kindly and unsolicited offered to give any contradiction I please to the calumny. You are at perfect liberty to make any use you please of this statement and letter. Again thanking you for your kindness, and assuring you that there is as much truth in other anecdotes concerning me which have been copied from paper into paper, as in the one of which you have written to me,

"I am yours very faithfully,

"N. CARDINAL WISEMAN."

CONVERSION OF MR. HENRY W. WILBERFORCE.

The following account of the conversion of Mr. Henry Wilberforce appeared in the *Times* of November 13 :—

"Mr. Henry William Wilberforce, vicar of East Farleigh, in the diocese of Canterbury, made his solemn abjuration of Anglicanism on the 15th of September in the chapel of the Company of Jesus at Brussels. This new conquest of the Roman Catholic Church is important in many respects. The new convert belongs to one of the most respected and popular families of England. He is the son of the celebrated William Wilberforce, one of greatest orators of his day, the friend of Pitt, and a member of the House of Commons for more than half a century. This illustrious man was only six days beyond the required age (21), when called by his native town, Hull, to represent it in Parliament. Six years later he was returned for York. About this time Mr. William Wilberforce, seeing the disorganised state of society, conceived the idea of reinstating it according to the Christian model. In 1797 he brought out his 'Practical View of the Prevailing Religious Systems.' According to the 'Bibliotheca Britannica' of Robert Watt, this book had passed through nine editions up to 1812, and since then it has been reprinted many times, and may now be found translated into several different languages. This work created a great sensation in England, and has contributed much to a change of morals, more particularly among the higher classes, many of whom were thus prepared for the change of faith they later adopted. One may almost say that Mr. Wilberforce was the advance guard of Puseyism, and that he smoothed the way to changes that are now taking place, of which his son has recently given so courageous an example. Mr. Henry Wilberforce is himself a very distinguished man; he is 43 years of age, and for the last seven years has enjoyed a benefice of the value of 1,000*l.* per annum. His taste for the more serious studies made him familiar with the holy Fathers, the great Catholic theologians, and the principal controversialists of the day, and it was only after several years of deep study that he decided to take the step and make the noble sacrifice. Determined to

embrace truth, whatever might be the cost, Mr. Wilberforce joined prayer, fasting, and good works to study in order to draw down light from Heaven. The first point that struck Mr. Wilberforce was, that the Anglican could not possibly be the true Church of Jesus Christ. He could not discover the great characteristic of Catholicity—universality, in a Church confined to a portion of the subjects of Queen Victoria; neither did he see in it apostolicity, since Henry VIII., its founder, cut it off by schism from the ancient trunk of the Roman Church. Mr. Wilberforce sought in vain within his own community for that infallible judge in controversies which is indispensable for maintaining unity in dogma and discipline. Of this the Gorham case furnished a new and striking proof. It became now evident to him he must either leave the Anglican Church or run the risk of falling into Rationalism, and it only remained for him to enter the fold of the Roman Church, in which he recognised all the characteristics of truth, unity, universality, apostolicity; he found she was one in her chief and in her doctrine, the same in all times and in all countries, from St. Peter down to Pius IX., from one extremity of the earth to the other.

“Arrived at this point in spite of the prejudices of education, before taking the final step, to mature, as far as possible, his deliberation, Mr. Wilberforce decided upon passing some days in retreat, and for this purpose chose the house of the Jesuit fathers at Brussels. Up to this time he had no personal knowledge of a single member of the Company of Jesus. He had, however, from the perusal of a single work by one of its members, conceived so high an opinion of the order, and particularly of its sainted founder, as to give the name of Ignatius to his youngest child. Mr. Wilberforce could now no longer hesitate, and he now claimed to be admitted into the Catholic Church. He was baptised *sub conditione* on the 15th of September, according to the full ceremonial prescribed by the Ritual, Messrs. Morgan and Ryder standing as godfathers, Mrs. Wilberforce being also present. From this time our new and illustrious convert has enjoyed a calm to which he had long been a stranger. He received confirmation on the 21st of September at the hands of his Eminence the Cardinal of Malines, in the chapel attached to the seminary.”

CONTENTS.

THE “ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.”

FIRST SERIES.—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman’s Pastoral; the two Letters to the “Times” by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell’s Letter; the “New Batch of Bishops,” from the “Weekly Dispatch;” two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D’Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips’s “Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;” concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES.—The Bishop of London’s Charge, at St. Paul’s Cathedral, Nov. 2, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming’s Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, Nov. 7, 1850.

THIRD SERIES.—The Rev. T. Nolan’s Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.: the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the “Vatican Masquerade.”

FOURTH SERIES.—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland (an original article), by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the “Queen and the Pope.”

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and Leading Articles from the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note by the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of “Catholicus;” Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

THE SEVENTH SERIES will contain some Leading Articles from the Journals on Cardinal Wiseman’s Appeal; and several Letters from Bishops of the Established Church.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

LEADING ARTICLES ON CARDINAL WISEMAN'S
MANIFESTO,

FROM THE DAILY AND WEEKLY PRESS;

ALSO

LETTERS AND REPLIES FROM THE BISHOPS OF THE
ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE
OF ENGLAND.

(From the "Atlas," Nov. 23rd.)

Cardinal Wiseman is at once the most polite and the most astute reasoner of his time. No wonder the Pope chose him for his first English metropolitan. The manifesto just issued by this most oily of arguers is a somewhat inconvenient reminder to this country of admissions and theories which it never expected to see fairly put in practice.

We have all of us in some relation of life granted a license to those about us which is all very well as long as it is in abeyance, but which grievously tests our temper whenever it chances to be claimed. We yielded in the first instance to the sense of right or of necessity, we got rid for the time of an unwelcome clamor, and we hugged ourselves on the quiet we had purchased by a cheap concession. But the concession is sure to be used, sooner or later, and then woe to the man who chances at such a moment to cross our tempers.

We have yielded to the Roman Catholics, one after another, those privileges which were demanded by the spirit and toleration of the age. We were tolerably convinced at the time that those privileges involved no danger to the principles of Protestantism. Even now, amidst all our excitement, we have no real dread of their effect. Yet we are always irritated whenever we see them put in practice. It is not from apprehension of the results that we cannot persuade ourselves to regard them quietly, but because they are a direct reminder of the existence amongst us of a large sect, whose profession jars on all we hold most dear to our liberties. We cannot endure to be practically compelled to reflect that there are amongst us many millions of men, who, in a nation peculiarly jealous of foreign interference, owe allegiance to a foreign potentate, who, in a nation above all others proud of independence of thought, would compel that thought to submit meekly to an Italian conclave, or to the decrees of Asiatic bishops, fifteen hundred years dead and buried, who in their mildest tone betray a latent fierceness—who in their eternal quotations of their own long-suffering exhibit an innate sense of the right to domineer, and a fixed assertion of the penal doom of their opponents.

It is thus that the Papal Bull, in its mere assertion of the principles of Popery, has roused the kingdom from one end to another. There is nothing in the Bull more aggressive than the bare existence of Romanism amongst us. It denies the Queen's supremacy: good—the Roman Catholics have always denied it. It creates a Romanist hierarchy; but the very essence of Romanism is a hierarchy. Throughout the Bull there is nothing new which is aggressive, and nothing aggressive that is new. But we don't like the reminder. Conscious of the existence of a party inimical to our dearest interests, so long as the party remains quiet we forget to be anxious. But, whenever it moves, though its movements are in accordance with all that we have been allowing and admitting for many a year past, we cannot restrain our indignation. And thus we put into their hands a series of unanswerable reproaches against the variance of our profession with our practice. Cardinal Wiseman can quote the tolerant phrases of every man now in power, to prove the innocence of what he is doing. He can call to his aid the rights of man, and the enlightenment of the nineteenth century. There is no answering his arguments upon his own ground, because Protestantism has taken up a false

one. It has levelled reproaches due to the very existence of the religion against the natural use made of that existence. It acknowledges the one, and then ignores the other, although its most simple consequence. The giant buried under Etna has turned on his side, and the eruption follows of course.

When the present commotion shall have subsided we shall be ready to acknowledge that Roman Catholicism under thirteen bishops is neither richer nor more formidable than it was under eight vicars apostolic. We may even feel more secure than ever, inasmuch as the recent outcry may assure us of the depth of the popular feeling in favour of Protestant liberty, and of the readiness of Protestantism to place itself on its guard. Fortified ourselves with the consciousness of all this, we may not begrudge the Romanists themselves the internal convenience which the new regulation will probably secure to them. It may be that the detested Bull may have the singular felicity of advantaging both of the rival sects; increasing the religious security of the one, and the religious comforts of the other.

(From "*The Spectator*," Nov. 23rd, 1830.)

Cardinal Wiseman has thrown himself into the fray, and at present bears the brunt of the Protestant assault. He addresses through the press "An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People;" and if one does not feel that he exhibits the missionary unction and a converting meekness of spirit, there is no doubt at all of his controversial power. Whether confuting the Premier on grounds of political precedent, meeting ecclesiastical opponents with appeals to principles of spiritual freedom, rebuking a partisan judge, or throwing sarcasm at the "indiffusive wealth" of a sacred establishment which has become literally hedged from the world by barriers of social depravity, he equally shows his mastery of dialectical resource. He proves himself a skilful wielder of the most effective and "slashing" reviewer's style: in the admiration of his literary ability he will, perhaps, not care to miss any acknowledgement that he has contributed extremely little to settle the polemic which the rulers of the Roman Church have unwisely stirred.

That Cardinal Wiseman has acted with propriety in making his appeal to the justice and fair play of the people of England is not to be doubted. Before the tribunal of public opinion he and his Church are arraigned, and by its verdict must they finally stand or fall. What effect his apology will produce upon the masses of our fellow-countrymen we have no means of yet deciding, nor can we form any very certain conjecture. Whether his explanations will have more influence in convincing the judgment and assuaging the indignation of the laity, or his relentless sarcasms succeed better in lashing into furious anger the outraged susceptibility of the clergy, remains to be seen. Allowing their full meed of controversial cleverness to the sallies of irony with which he has relieved his clear exposition of facts and his skilful arrangement of arguments, we think he might more wisely have confined himself to a calm statement of the motives which led to, and the reasons which seemed to warrant, a restoration of its normal government to the Roman Catholic Church in this country. The man of letters, the religious pamphleteer, has, we suspect, gained a victory over the prince of the Church, the wily ecclesiastic, which he may find cause to regret. At least, his habitual knowledge of the English people, his habitual diplomatic skill, must have forsaken him, if he thought to advance his cause, to lay the storm of indignation and alarm, by sneers however refined, by taunts however effective, directed against the shortcomings of our National Church, against the faults of our Bishops and Cathedral dignitaries. Great licence as we Englishmen take in occasionally abusing both—chiefly because they are not sufficiently Protestant, not sufficiently national and comprehensive—we greatly mistake our countrymen if they will, even those of them who most widely differ in doctrine and ritual, join in hallooing on a Romanist prelate to his game, or chuckle at the hard hits he succeeds in planting on his adversary's face. One impression that this Appeal has clearly made, is that of extreme surprise at its contrast in style and tone with the pastoral address by which the Cardinal-Archbishop solemnised his appointment to his Metropolitan see. In spite of the attempted explanation, that the one was a formal document, necessarily couched in official language, while the other is the unfettered discourse of a citizen to his fellow-citizens, all will feel that the two are not only different but irreconcilable, except upon that conventional distinction between the man and the official which has long been held up to ridicule and scouted by the indignation of honest people. And we know nothing more likely to keep alive the suspicion and dislike which Englishmen generally confess towards the Romanist system and its ecclesiastics, than to find one of the most eminent of those ecclesiastics one week putting forth a solemn instrument whose arrogance is only not appalling because it is ludicrously applied, and the next stepping into the popular arena and protesting against a literal understanding of that instrument—declaring its lordly presumption to be merely official, and its real purport to be meek, unassuming, and inoffensive. At any rate, we are at a loss to decide which is the genuine expression of the man and of his system; and most of us will be more inclined to attach importance to that which comes stamped with the authority of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, than to place implicit reliance on the deprecatory explanation of Nicholas Wiseman.

We must not, however, allow ourselves to be prevented by considerations of this sort from giving to the facts and arguments brought forward in the Appeal a fair judicial consideration,

The question at issue is, Has the Pope violated our laws, encroached upon the limits of toleration established by the Emancipation and similar subsequent Acts, and offered insult to our Sovereign and our nation, by constituting Bishops in England with English sees? Looking to the tone and manner of the Bull by which this was effected, and the pastoral address by which it was inaugurated, we called it a wanton aggression, an imbecile impertinence; and we contemplated the possibility of Parliament being required by the angry people to visit with penalties the assumption of English titles conferred by a foreign prince. The perusal of Cardinal Wiseman's Appeal confirms us in our view. There seems no good ground for supposing that the Pope's proceeding is contrary to our statutes. There is especial force in the argument that the express prohibition against Romanist prelates in this country assuming the titles of the sees of the Established Church acts as a tacit permission to assume those of any other sees they may choose to constitute; though it yet remains to be seen whether our judges may not construe this prohibition as extending to titles derived from any place contained within the prohibited sees; in which case, the recent assumption would of course be illegal and invalid. Still, as such extension was not, we believe, contemplated by the framers of that clause, we hope that, as in the case of all penal and disqualifying enactments, a liberal interpretation will be the one adopted. It does, moreover, seem to follow, as Lord Lyndhurst says, that "if the law allows the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be allowed to be carried out perfectly and properly." This can, of course, only be done through a normally-constituted hierarchy; and this again must be called into existence by the Pope. So far we only recognise the strictly logical result of the Romanist Church system, and of the Emancipation Act of our own Legislature. It is against the next step that we take arms. Had the Romanists acknowledged as their religious head one who was neither a foreign potentate nor the tool of foreign potentates, they might then, like the Methodists and every other sect, have received from this head any organisation he or they pleased—the people of England would not have troubled themselves about the titles their district officers assumed. But so long as the Pope is not only the head of the Catholic world, but the temporal ruler of Rome, and in that capacity the ally or the foe of other temporal Sovereigns, and likely, as the consequence of his mundane ambitions and embroilments, to interfere in the civil affairs and require the military aid of other European Governments, we cannot practically regard him as merely the supreme ruler of the Church, nor allow him to make arrangements and bestow titles in our country, which have been in past times, and may be again, notoriously influenced by quite other than spiritual considerations, and made to subserve quite other than either Catholic or English aims. What, then, may be asked, were loyal English Catholics to do? To violate their duty to their country and Sovereign, or to mutilate the organisation of their Church? Neither was necessary, we conceive. There was one way out of this dilemma, which would have reconciled the conflicting claims of patriotism and religion; a way, too, which the concessions of the English Parliament and the known tendencies of English statesmen seemed expressly to suggest. An appeal to the nation and the Parliament—backed, as we believe it would have been, by all the statesmen of the day—to carry out to its full completion the act of 1829, by sanctioning a regular government of the Roman Catholic Church in England, under such stipulations and conditions as should be deemed necessary for securing the independence or calming the fears of the people, would doubtless have met with temporary opposition, but would have finally prevailed over clamour and apprehension. Such, however, has not been the course adopted by the persons who are responsible for the proceedings now called in question. Addressing themselves directly to the Pope, and letting escape only the obscurest hints of what they were about, they have come down upon us with their new ecclesiastical constitution like a thief in the night; and, in well-affected surprise at the confusion and dismay excited by their act, they profess that what they have done is the most natural and necessary thing in the world, and what was to be expected, and, indeed, only the strictly logical consequence of acts of our own. This it is which we call a wanton aggression, an imbecile impertinence, on the part of Pope and Prelates: that whereas there was a way of effecting a perfectly legitimate object in a perfectly inoffensive manner, they have chosen just the most offensive, and probably the least effectual, method of gaining their desired ends; and all that Cardinal Wiseman has quoted from the speeches of our statesmen, or stated of the actions of our Government, to justify himself, only increases our sense of the wantonness of the aggression and the imbecility of the impertinence. For the more strongly those speeches were in favour of giving to the Roman Catholics in England even a more unrestricted freedom than they have themselves assumed, the more the actions of the Executive tended towards concession and respect, surely the greater obligation was imposed upon the Pope and his advisers to compass their ends in the manner most plainly in harmony with the Constitution, and least offensive to our Queen and her Protestant subjects.

One word upon the sarcasms which the Cardinal has, with such evident relish and such elaborated point, levelled against the Protestant Establishment. That they are tellingly phrased and artistically balanced no one will deny. True, that the English Church has no "clear, definite, and accordant teaching" upon many propositions which the Holy See has irrevocably asserted. It has not definitely pronounced that the sun moves round the earth, and so put itself in eternal opposition to science. It has never deliberately set its sanction on

the murder of those who differ from it, by striking a medal and instituting a solemn thanksgiving to God in honour of a Protestant St. Bartholomew, and so been ever after as a need of history. It has never organised a conspiracy against activity of thought and the sanctities of domestic life, and so found itself at once antagonist to philosophy and morality. These things it has not done; and we can excuse it for being less definite than its rival upon the immaculate conception, and more reserved in its claims to infallible authority and miraculous powers. So, again, when he contrasts "the little paradise of comfort, cheerfulness, and ease," which in ancient times would have clustered round a wealthy cathedral establishment, with the haunts of squalid wretchedness which now present themselves "in frightful contrast, though in close contact," with the magnificence of the Abbey of his see, we can take comfort from remembering, that while the Church whose tender care of the people he artfully insinuates has fostered sleek idleness and self-despairing inaction, it has ever been found to check the commercial prosperity and the political development of a nation, except when, as in the case of Belgium, these have been pushed forward by forces opposed to its influence and too powerful for its control.

(From the "Examiner," Nov. 23rd.)

It is a very different performance from his pastoral letter, little objectionable in style, often felicitous, decorous in manner, dexterous in argument, and not wanting in telling hits, especially those against the riches of our hierarchy. On the other hand, the Doctor is "umble" in the spirit of Uriah Heep, and his profoundest humility is assumed to humiliate most bitterly the opulent Church to which he is antagonist. He sues in *forma pauperis*, to shame the wealth and state of the Protestant Establishment. Withal, he has no scruples in seizing any ground of vantage, whether real or *ad captandum*; and seems best pleased to turn the works of the old champions of Catholic Emancipation against them, and to make them appear answerable for all that is now exasperating the public mind. "Eaten bread" is proverbially soon forgotten, but the eaten bread in this instance is well remembered in order to be pleaded as warrant for encroachment; and the relief conceded to Catholics by our State is made the express ground for the present offensive pretensions by the power ignoring our State—not ignoring its past liberality and justice indeed, recollecting them so to repay them—but ignoring its present existence and rights. The whole gist of the argument, indeed, is, "You have granted us so much that we must take all. You have rendered to us what is ours so unreservedly that we must take what is yours. You have yielded us our equitable place in the country, so your country shall be brought under the authority and jurisdiction of Rome."

We will not say that there is ingratitude in this, for concessions of justice raise no claim on gratitude; but there is no good spirit, and much insolence in it: and though there is no actual injury there is the confessed intention of injury; for Dr. Wiseman does not shrink from the avowal that Romish aggrandisement at the expense of Protestantism is the aim of this innovation.

There is a passage in the Appeal with a part of which we thoroughly and sorrowfully agree:—
"Believe me, at this moment, the danger to the religious and civil liberties of Englishmen is not from any infringement on them by the Pope, in granting to English Catholics what I hope to show you that they had full right to obtain from him, but from those who are taking advantage of the occurrence to go back a step if they can in the legislation of toleration, and take away from a large body of Englishmen what at present is lawful to them in regard to the free exercise of their religion."

The language which is beginning to be held, and to find, we grieve to add, partial approval. At the City meeting on Nov. 21st, Mr. Alderman Lawrence is reported to have said:—

"They were all arrayed there against the bigotry and intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church. Its hostility to spiritual freedom was constant; its intolerance was never ceasing, and could only be met by intolerance. (Cheers, and loud cries of "No, no.") They who were the friends of civil and religious liberty would gain in advocating freedom and toleration: but if its extension would lead to aggression he would be for removing toleration. (Cries of "No, no.")

Toleration is but another word for equity; and as well might Mr. Lawrence argue that if a man attempted to do him an injustice, he had the right to do him an injustice in return, or that if a thief endeavoured to pick his pocket, he, in retaliation, should rob him of his coat. Protestantism is strangely vindicated by principles so alien to Christianity. Dr. Cumming, whose fealty to toleration was so lately mentioned by us with praise, now coolly proposes, amidst loud cheers, that her Majesty shall cause all the Romish Bishops to be shipped off and transported to Rome.

Dr. Wiseman records the very sensible remark of the Dean of Westminster as to the meditated invasion of his title:—

"All Catholics knew of the intended measure; the papers announced it; so notorious was it, that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster petitioned Parliament against it; and a friend of the writer's heard the Dean of Westminster say, most openly, 'Well, he may call himself what he pleases, but at least he can never be Dean of Westminster.'"

He also quotes the opinion of Lord Stanley to the same effect:—

"In 1841, or 1842, when, for the first time, the Holy See thought of erecting a hierarchy in North America, I was commissioned to sound the feelings of Government on the subject. I came up to London for the purpose, and saw the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, of which Lord Stanley was the secretary. I shall not easily forget the urbanity of my reception, or the interesting conversation that took place, in which much was spoken to me which has since come literally true. But on the subject of my mission the answer given was somewhat to this effect: - 'What does it matter to us what you call yourselves, whether Vicars-Apostolic, or Bishops, or Missions, or Imams, so that you do not ask us to do anything for you? We have no right to prevent you taking any title among yourselves.'"

But they might have taken their titles, and played out their masquerade, without ignoring the Protestant nation, and claiming the whole kingdom as pertaining to Rome. His Holiness treats England as Mr. Webster ("the matchless" of Sir Henry Bulwer) treats a runaway black; he says, You belong to me, you have no title to yourself, the indefeasible title to your body is mine.

Into the question of supremacy we have not room to enter at any length. The spiritual supremacy of the Pope is a cardinal article of the Roman Catholic faith, and to deny it would be tantamount to saying there shall be no Catholics. But it is not so easy or so possible, as the Catholics contend, to separate the spiritual from the temporal authority; and it may be found necessary, and may be practicable, to define the line of action beyond which a spiritual authority, derived from a foreign source, shall not trespass into temporal ground, and shall not be suffered to frustrate the ends of legislation. It is not in the power of law to control the double allegiance in the hearts of Roman Catholics, but it is in the power of the law to pursue in the field of action, and punish, the perversion of the spiritual authority of foreign derivation to temporal misuses and troubles.

(From the "Times" of Nov. 22, 1850.)

Is the division of England into Roman Catholic bishoprics within the letter of the law? Is it the legitimate and perfect development of the Roman Catholic religion as a system? Does it trench on any one's rights? These are the three questions upon which, according to Drs. Wiseman, Newman, and Bowyer, the merits of the question now at issue between the Pope and the people of England depend; and they answer them accordingly.

Now, as to the first, we have never been referred by any one to any law of this country the letter of which has been infringed by the Pope or his emissaries. Our whole conduct has been inconsistent with such a belief. Had we thought that what has been done could be redressed by the jurisdiction of our ordinary tribunals, we should never have dreamt of invading the functions of a jury and rousing the indignation of the public against persons in the unfortunate position of State criminals; it is because we believe there is, at present, no bar, save that of public opinion, at which these bold men can be arraigned that we devote our columns to the exposure of their fallacies and the resistance of their aggressions. We are therefore quite willing to concede to Dr. Wiseman that his ingenious evasion of the Emancipation Act may avail him at the Old Bailey; and that the clause which forbids the assumption of the titles of English bishops by Roman Catholics would not in a criminal case be held to extend to titles newly coined in the papal mint of honour. We also concede that the Roman Catholics are not bound to acknowledge the Queen's supremacy in spiritual matters, and we have no objection to allow that the Roman Catholic religion, in its high and palmy state, requires a territorial dominion co-extensive and co-equal with the land it inhabits. But surely the admission of all this, which is all that the Cardinal and his two doctors have proved or attempted to prove, goes no way at all towards establishing that the indignation of the people of England is unjust, that their jealousy is unfounded, or that their grievances are imaginary. All that has been propounded by these learned personages was perfectly well known to every speaker and writer of the most ordinary intelligence who has taken part in the discussion which the rashness and insolence of a few ambitious ecclesiastics have in an evil hour for themselves forced upon us. The people of England regard this question neither from the legal or Old Bailey point of view, nor yet with the eyes of those one-sided reasoners who can see nothing but the development of their own faith. It is on national, on loyal, on constitutional grounds that they take their stand. The Church of England is not merely a voluntary association, enjoying peculiar privileges, as Dr. Wiseman insinuates; it is a part, and an integral part, of the ancient constitution of this country. The Sovereign is and must be its head; it is fully represented in the highest court of judicature; and though it tolerates the widest dissent from its opinions, it is only on condition that no act shall be done subversive of its temporal or spiritual pre-eminence. Within these limits Roman Catholics and Dissenters are at liberty to develop their own systems as fully as they please. If the letter of the law suffer them to go beyond this, they cannot avail themselves of it without infringing the spirit and genius of our institutions, and arousing the just susceptibilities of the nation, which, when its will is once deliberately matured and clearly expressed, is as little disposed to tolerate evasion or permit disobedience as the successor of St. Peter himself. We might be well content to rest our answer here, satisfied with pointing out that to invade the spiritual jurisdiction of the

Established Church under a claim not merely of co-ordinate but of paramount spiritual authority derived from a foreign prince is not merely an attack upon a rival sect, but an aggression on the Crown and Constitution of these realms, because of that Church—the Crown is the head, of that Constitution the Church is a part. But the case does not rest here. The Roman Catholics have not, that we are aware, violated the law, but they have evaded it: they have the letter on their side; the people who made the law have the spirit on theirs. And what is that law? It is the Emancipation Act of 1829, won for them against unparalleled difficulties by the generous exertions of the members of that very Church which they are cajoling, betraying, and invading—in a breath, it is the charter of their political liberties and spiritual freedom which they now seek to clude and undermine by all the arts of sophistry and chicanery. Either the Emancipation Act was a boon conceded to a suffering class of her Majesty's subjects by the grace and favour of the British people, or it was a great act of national reconciliation—a solemn compact between the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority, by which, in consideration of the removal of all civil disabilities, the Roman Catholics covenanted so to use the spiritual liberty which was granted them as not to infringe upon the temporal or spiritual rights of others. Mr. Bowyer in his pamphlet admits that the relations which, according to the law of the land, the Roman Catholics bear to the See of Rome clearly appear from the oath contained in the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act; in other words, that this oath fairly embodies the understanding as to the conduct and dispositions of the Roman Catholics upon which this act was passed. The words he quotes are the following:—

“And I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other person whatsoever. And I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, State, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or *indirectly* within this realm.”

Thus far Mr. Bowyer. We request our readers to attend to the sequel of the oath, which, for obvious reasons, he has not thought fit to insert:—

“I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws. And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church establishment as settled by law within this realm. And I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom.”

“The question, then, is reduced to a very narrow issue. This oath, by the admission of Mr. Bowyer, contains the relation of the Roman Catholics to the See of Rome, and therefore, by necessary consequence, to the Church and State of England. Is the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, with his territorial jurisdiction without personal limitation, true to the terms and spirit of this compact? Is not the conferring of titles of honour—purely spiritual honour, if he please—by the Pope, at least indirectly an act of civil pre-eminence within this realm? Does the Roman Catholic ecclesiastic who assumes the primacy of England for the See of Westminster without limitation or qualification, and therefore to the exclusion of the present primate, do his utmost to *defend* the settlement of the Church within this realm, or is he not palpably the aggressor against whom it must be defended? Is it no disturbance of the Protestant religion or Government of this realm of England to establish in it an hierarchy co-extensive, co-equal, co-ordinate with the Protestant hierarchy, which, as far as words and professions can go, is wholly ignored and set aside? Is it to strengthen or to weaken the Protestant religion that, according to Dr. Wiseman's own statement, this step has been taken? His words are “Many minds allowed themselves to be influenced by the apparent advantage of ecclesiastical position on the other side.” It was, then, to create a state of things upon which a controversial argument to *weaken* the case of the Church of England as against the Church of Rome might be founded that this change, according to the evidence of its promoter, negotiator, and defender, was made. Most true, Dr. Wiseman disclaims any but spiritual jurisdiction, and in a spirit of arrogant humility and insolent self-abasement expresses his willingness to leave the temporalities of the English Church to their present possessors, provided he be allowed, holy and humble that he is, to pursue his noiseless and unobtrusive ministry amid the poor and afflicted. Surely here is a little confusion between giving and taking. The Pope *gives all*, spiritual and temporal, without restriction or qualification. The Cardinal *takes* exactly as much as he can get. We have little reason to thank him for his moderation. The grapes are sour; but if he be indeed a faithful representative of that Church which sold the gifts of the Holy Spirit and the license to commit sin, which has ever regarded its spiritual claims as mere means and appliances to its temporal aggrandisement, and which surfeited on the plunder of Christendom till the human mind, even in the days of its darkness, rose up against its insatiable avarice, he will not, longer than he is absolutely obliged, content his appetite with hungry spiritualities. It would be as reasonable for a privateer which sheers off from a vessel it dares not attack to deny possession of a letter of marque as for the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, with the full commission of the Pope to clutch all he

can in his pocket, to affect a contempt for the temporalities of the Church of England. We may be well assured that if he be reduced to the state of primitive simplicity of which he boasts, it is not because a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic desires little, but because we will not give more.

(From the "Morning Chronicle," Nov. 21, 1850)

We published at length in our impression of yesterday Cardinal Wiseman's voluminous and ably-written "Appeal to the People of England." It was not difficult to anticipate its tone or its tenor. The same skilful adaptation of manner to circumstances which induced the titular metropolitan, in his inaugural address to the faithful, to assume the pompous and confident tone of a Dunstan or an a'Becket, is illustrated by the mild resignation of his plea for continued tolerance among a Protestant community. The No-Popery agitation, which has unfortunately been excited by Lord John Russell's ill judged attempt to acquire popularity by an appeal to religious bigotry, furnishes the Cardinal with the most plausible and effective portion of his argument; and should his obvious endeavour to enlist on his side the feelings and convictions of the Protestant Dissenting community be attended with a success proportioned to its dexterity and tact, the result will be largely due to the short-sightedness of the former patron of "civil and religious liberty" in affording so excellent a handle to the Papal divine. We have anticipated, and we concur in, Dr. Wiseman's just complaint of the factious and dishonest conduct of the ermined partisan, "who preferred to deliver his award against us from behind the tables of a Mansion-house banquet, and to elicit the anti Popish cheers of his civic companions, rather than the honoured approbation of the peerage and the bar;" nor are we surprised at, his remarks on the flippant language which a more honest and respectable functionary was tempted to use with respect to "the religion of many millions of her Majesty's subjects, nearly all Ireland, and some of our most flourishing colonies." "The charge," he adds, "uttered in the ear of that island, in which all guarantees for genuine and pure Catholic education will of necessity be considered in future as guarantees for 'confining the intellect and enslaving the soul'—all securities for the Catholic religion as security for 'the mummeries of superstition' in the mind of their giver—guarantees and securities which can hardly be believed to be heartily offered—the charge thus made, in a voice that has been applauded by the Protestantism of England, produces in the Catholic heart a feeling too sickly and too deadening for indignation; a dismal despair at finding that, where we have honoured, and supported, and followed for years, we may be spurned and cast off the first moment that popularity demands us as its price, or bigotry as its victim." In this passage, Dr. Wiseman only expresses the feelings of all Roman Catholics with respect to the Prime Minister's attack upon their creed. Mr. Howard, of Corby Castle, publishes his "conviction that the phrase 'mummeries of superstition' can only be looked upon as a deliberate insult to the faith and religious practice of at least one-third of the loyal subjects of the British realm." The singular attempt which has been made to defend the grave indiscretion of the Premier's manifesto, on the pretext that it was intended chiefly to express his antipathy to a party in the English Church, has only brought into a stronger light the exclusively sectarian purpose of his interference. By combining a rebuke of the Romanist aggression with an insult to those who may hold particular theological opinions, Lord John Russell abandoned his tenable position as a national statesman for the questionable character of an ill-informed controversialist. If the party on which he volunteered a censure has anything in common with Rome, it is certainly not its political ambition nor its intrusion of a foreign territorial episcopate. Its "superstitious mummeries" can only be those of the Roman Catholic Church, and its steps approach the verge of no "precipice" except that of Popery. Neither Dr. Wiseman nor his lay co-religionists will easily be persuaded that a denunciation of a supposed approximation to the distinctive doctrines of their Church, issued on the occasion of a measure in which that Church was exclusively concerned, was a mere expression of irrelevant and illogical spite against a party in the Establishment who were entirely opposed to the measure which formed the subject of complaint.

We regret that the false position taken up by the Prime Minister should have enabled Cardinal Wiseman to assume, with so much plausibility and success, the defensive position of representative of an injured and insulted community. He shows much ingenuity in pointing out the inconsistency of the officials who are so greatly surprised at the new Romish aggression, and so eager to attribute it to theological tendencies which they are pleased to stigmatise as heretical. With a malicious pleasure he recapitulates the successive acknowledgments which the No-Popery Ministers have found it expedient to make of the pretensions of Romanist prelates to territorial authority in the empire. The recognition by the Government of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Australia, and the legal sanction conferred by provincial Acts on the titles of the bishops of the same Church in various parts of our North American provinces, are not unnaturally put forward in contrast with the zeal which, not content with resenting the encroachments of the Pope, extends to the condemnation of his "superstitious mummeries."

The Bishop of Exeter, in an address to his clergy, which will perhaps remind Lord John Russell of former unpleasant collisions with that able prelate, carries Dr. Wiseman's well-founded *argumentum ad hominem* into instructive detail. He further quotes a speech of Lord Grey, in which the latter expresses a wish to see the prelates of the Irish Roman Catholic

Church taking their seats on the benches of the House of Lords—and also an official declaration by Lord John Russell, that he had superseded in practice the prohibition imposed by the Roman Catholic Relief Act against the assumption in public by Roman Catholic prelates of the distinctive insignia of their order. The Bishop may well “stand aghast at—I will not say the unfairness, I will not say the unmanliness—but I will say the prodigious hardihood of the noble lord’s reliance on such forgetfulness of recent facts, or such utter disregard of truth and justice, as he is thus pleased to attribute to the people of England.”

If it is possible to disabuse Exeter Hall of its faith in its new and distinguished convert and champion, Dr. Wiseman’s statement, that the Government was, three years ago, officially informed of the scheme which has now been accomplished, may perhaps tend to accelerate the process of enlightenment. “I have already alluded,” he says, “to Lord Minto’s being shown the brief for the hierarchy, printed about two [three] years ago. The circumstance may have escaped his memory, or he may not at that time have attended to it, having more important matter in his mind. But as to the fact that his attention was called to it, and that he made no reply, I can have no doubt.” The Cardinal’s supposition that the itinerant Cabinet Minister may have thought the matter which has so strongly excited his official superior’s indignation too trifling for notice, is humorous—and the more so because it is probably true. Lord Minto’s hopeless ignorance of the political questions with which he was instructed to deal in Italy will probably always remain incredible to those who do not take the trouble to verify it by examining the official despatches; but that a mere hierarchical change in the Roman Catholic organisation in England could in any way concern his Sovereign, or her subjects, or form a reason for weakening the Parliamentary alliance between the Roman Catholic body and the Family League, was a thought too foreign to a mind such as Lord Minto’s to have been likely to occur or to impress itself. It is not by religious considerations, or by conflicts between sacerdotal intrigue and a national spirit of independence, that the political world is moved, in Whig estimation, or according to the experience of the chief of the Elliots. Electioneering conflicts in “Mintshire” were not wont to turn on such irrelevant questions, but on the right of the ruling family, and of its most fortunate section, to divide among its members the honours and offices of the empire.

If, thus far, in considering Cardinal Wiseman’s pamphlet, we have seemed to attribute too much weight to arguments in favour of a measure which we reprobate, and which we have reprobated from the first, we may remind our readers that we have hitherto dealt only with the personal and accidental advantages with which the imprudence of his opponents has furnished him in the dispute. He is right in defending his religion against insult, and he is excusable in pointing out the inconsistencies of the Minister who denounces him; but his defence of the measure which the Pope has adopted at his instigation, and at that of his colleagues, remains where it was before. We shall proceed in another article to inquire whether he offers any reasons which ought to change the universal opinion of England. It does not follow, from the inconsistency or from the blunders of a Minister, that the policy which he may have supported up to a certain point, and which he may afterwards repudiate in an untenable argument, is itself prudent or justifiable. Lord John Russell, with all his errors, is, perhaps, more in the right than the calm-tempered prelate who so ingeniously profits by them. But our space will not allow of our carrying the inquiry further on the present occasion.

(From the “*Leader*,” Nov. 23, 1850.)

Cardinal Wiseman’s Manifesto must now settle the matter for ever in the minds of the candid. He not only proves the perfect legality of the change, and its strictly *sectarian* nature, but he also proves that this Government was fully aware of the contemplated change, and quotes the emphatic language of Lord John Russell in 1846, that it was not possible to prevent the Pope from introducing Bulls into this country appointing bishops and pastors to the Roman Catholic Church: a postscript to Lord John’s much-praised, “vigorous protest,” which reads querulously to those who attached any serious meaning to that letter beyond the Whig clap-net of a bid for support! The Cardinal’s Manifesto is, unhappily, of a length which will damage its effect, for prejudiced readers will hardly wade through it; but, to show how completely he makes out his case, we need only refer to the leading article in the *Times*. That journal was the first to thunder at the Papal Bull; it now virtually eats its own words, and the only answer it can make to the Manifesto is, “If that was your meaning, why did you not say so at first?” He did say so at first, in spite of his rhodomontade. The *Leader* never for a moment misunderstood the meaning of the new hierarchy; we always said that it did not affect *Protestant* England, but only the Roman Catholics in England.

(From the “*London News*,” Nov. 23, 1850.)

Cardinal Wiseman’s disclaimer of any denial of the Queen’s temporal supremacy deserves praise as a piece of composition. It is so temperate and logical, as to increase the public regret that it did not appear a month ago, before the mischief was done, and before this angry flood of theological bitterness was let loose over the land. We wish we could indulge in the

hope that it will be effective for the purposes for which it appears to have been framed, and shall greatly rejoice if, at the eleventh hour, it should tend in any degree, however slight, to abate the public mistrust of any class of our fellow-subjects. Whatever distrust may remain will be entirely chargeable upon the blatant indiscretion of the many over-sanguine priests of the Roman persuasion, who have tortured what, if we are to believe Cardinal Wiseman, was a harmless domestic arrangement among the Roman Catholics themselves, into an aggression—in words if not in deeds—against the Protestant faith and people of this country.

The first alarm has blown over, but no small portion of the indignation remains. It will be well for the Church of England, against whom, and not against the Dissenters, the exultation of Drs. Ullathorne and Wiseman was directed, if the unfriendly criticism of either of them shall have the effect of reviving a zeal which has slumbered—of removing the doubt which was fast leading many conscientious but wavering men into error, and of knitting together in a firmer bond than before the various parties that were forming within its bosom, and threatening it with disruption. Even the taunt of a foe may be productive of good, and the rebuke of an opponent may excite the serious thought which the remonstrances of a friend may have failed to call forth. Many of the sincerest well-wishers of the Church of England have dwelt upon abuses which it would have been for her interest to have remedied long ago; but hitherto the warnings and remonstrances have for the most part fallen upon inattentive, pre-occupied, or obstinate minds. The sneers of Cardinal Wiseman may possibly excite more attention, and produce more good. Those are truly the wise men who profit by what their enemies say of them.

When Cardinal Wiseman promises that he will visit the shrine of St. Edward, “and meditate on the olden times when the church filled without a coronation, and multitudes hourly worshipped without a service,” he administers a reproof not the less valuable because it comes from unfriendly lips. When he adds, “that he will pay his entrance-fee to go into Westminster Abbey like other liege subjects; that he will resign himself meekly to the guidance of the beadle, and listen without rebuke when he points out to his admiration detestable monuments, or shows a hole in the wall for a confessional,” it is impossible to deny that the Roman Catholic dignitary, however much he may err on the doctrinal and theological points in dispute, has discovered and assailed a weak point in the administration of the Abbey. It has been too long a subject of scandal that an admission-fee should be demanded at the doors of our metropolitan cathedrals, and that these magnificent edifices, the pride of London, should only be known by their outsides to the great masses of the people. The Cardinal’s criticism, as regards the “detestable” monuments, might have been spared; but, in other respects, however unpalatable it may be, there is too much foundation for his hard words to allow them to fall unproductively.

We heartily wish, for the sake of the Church of England, that his still keener criticism upon the spiritual destitution of the district immediately around Westminster Abbey were not supported by facts. “In ancient times,” he says, “the existence of an abbey on any spot, with a large staff of clergy and ample revenues, would have sufficed to create around it a little paradise of comfort, cheerfulness, and ease. This, however, is not now the case. Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and courts, and alleys and slums, nests of ignorance, vice, depravity, and crime, as well as of squalor, wretchedness, and disease; whose atmosphere is typhus, whose ventilation is cholera; in which swarms a huge and almost countless population, in great measure, nominally at least, Catholic; haunts of filth, which no sewage committee can reach—dark corners, which no lighting-board can brighten. This is the part of Westminster which alone I covet, and which I shall be glad to claim and to visit as a blessed pasture in which sheep of Holy Church are to be tended, in which a bishop’s godly work has to be done, of consoling, converting, and preserving. And if, as I humbly trust in God, it shall be seen that this special culture, arising from the establishment of our hierarchy, bears fruit of order, peacefulness, decency, religion, and virtue, it may be that the Holy See shall not be thought to have acted unwisely, when it bound up the very soul and salvation of a chief pastor with those of a city where the name indeed is glorious, but the purlieus infamous—in which the very grandeur of its public edifices is as a shadow, to screen from the public eye sin and misery the most appalling. If the wealth of the Abbey be stagnant, and not diffusive—if it in no way rescue the neighbouring population from the depths in which it is sunk, let there be no jealousy of any one who, by whatever name, is ready to make the latter his care, without interfering with the former.” If the sarcasm of Dr. Wiseman, and his too faithful description of the wretched purlieus of Westminster Abbey—without exception, the most immoral and degraded portion of this great metropolis—shall stir up the zeal of the clergy who participate in the revenues and emoluments of the Abbey to investigate the condition of the population around them; if it shall induce them to establish additional schools for the swarming children of poverty and vice—to visit more frequently the outcasts of society in their miserable homes, and to sit with more kindness and zeal at the bedside of the expiring sinner, something better than theological rancour will have been excited, and good will have flowed even from so unwelcome a source as the assumptions and presumptions of Popery.

We earnestly hope that, amid many other good results which may be expected, sooner or later, from the shock which the Church of England and the feelings of the people have received, a revival of sympathy between Church and people may be the most conspicuous and the most lasting. The lesson has been a rude one, but it cannot with truth be said that it was not needed.

(From the "*Weekly News*," Nov. 23rd, 1850.)

"*Acer Romanus in armis*
Injusto sub fasce viam quum carpit, et hosti
Ante expectatum positus stat in agmine castris."

VIRG. GEORG. iii. 347.

The Cardinal has astonished the natives. Our anti-Popery zealots hardly knew that Dr. Wiseman had left the "Flaminian Gate" when, lo! he appears, and issues a Manifesto, in which he certainly deals slashing blows, right and left, among his assailants, even if he does not succeed in parrying all those that have been aimed at his own party. We have seldom read an abler specimen of controversial writing than this document, and the grace of its style, the simple clearness of its language (where it suits the writer to be clear), the polished keenness of its sarcasms, and the occasional beauty of its descriptions, make it as agreeable to the reader as it is able.

The injudicious exhibitions in which certain grave judicial personages have lately indulged for the sake of acquiring popularity by their Protestant zeal, are admirably criticised by the calmly severe and courteously cruel Catholic champion. The pomps and riches of our Anglican clergy are made adroitly prominent, when their ecclesiastic thunders against the new unendowed rival hierarchy are referred to. There is a skilful and seemingly frank appeal to the national love of fair-play, and a well-worded protest against the mob-violence with which the Catholics have in some instances been threatened during the recent excitement. Where the Cardinal handles our statesmen, he exposes their inconsistencies and vacillations in merciless though in apparently humble style. It is, in short, an admirable reply to a great number of bad advocates of the opposite side, so far as regards the exposure of their advocacy. But, whether it grapples fairly with the substantial merits of the case, and proves its writer to have the best side of the cause, as well as the greatest cleverness in conducting it, is quite another affair.

Dr. Wiseman maintains two points respecting the recent Papal parceling out of England into new bishoprics, and establishment of a Catholic hierarchy. He maintains, first, that it is strictly within the letter of the law of the land; and, secondly, that there is nothing in it at which the English nation might fairly be expected to take offence. These are the real points of his Manifesto: not, indeed, thus expressly stated; for he is too adroit a disputant for that but they form in substance his defence of what has been done; and it is essential to his success that he should prove both. In our opinion he has proved neither.

In the first place, as to the strict legality of the appointment of this batch of Romish Bishops. The Cardinal argues very skilfully and learnedly that no law is broken by himself and his suffragans assuming episcopal titles in England, provided they do not assume the titles of the sees of the English Church. We do not say whether he is right on this or not. But the cunning Cardinal, while he is copious on the topic of the titles, wholly shirks the matter of the illegality of bringing the Pope's Bull into this country, without which Catholic Bishops cannot be created. There is no denying that the introduction of Papal Bulls is still forbidden by her statute law. We have here, then, a manifest misdemeanour, and it is impossible to maintain that the law has not been, and must not be, broken in every case of making Catholic Bishops in this country.

So much for the mere letter of the law. Now for the far more important point, whether what has been done was calculated to give reasonable offence to the great majority of the nation. We call this the more important point, because we should not think very much of the neglect of an old penal statute, if it occurred in the course of any measure not of itself offensive.

The Cardinal gives many reasons why it is desirable that Catholics should have Bishops; he quotes many cases in which our Legislature has sanctioned the existence of Catholic Bishops in Ireland and in our colonies. But all this cannot prove the propriety of such a step as the present. The Pope suddenly appoints a whole hierarchy at once for England. He carves our island out into territories, each of which is to be under a Catholic prelate, subordinate to the Roman Pontiff, and not to the English Sovereign. We must insist on the fact that Pio Nono's new Bishops are to be Bishops of districts, not Bishops of the Catholics in each district; that Dr. Wiseman is to be Metropolitan of England, not Metropolitan of the Catholics in England. This is far from a verbal distinction. Dr. Wiseman once or twice (forgetting his usual caution) drops the phrase, that there is nothing new in the claim of the Pope to do all this; and that he is only assuming the same rights as his predecessors. We know this full well; and we also know what the Papal claims were and are as to their power, and that of their clergy in their episcopates.

Dr. Wiseman says, that the English Catholics asked for Bishops. We know that they did;

but it was for an episcopate of a very different kind to that which the Pope has given them. The English Catholics wished their Bishops to be nominated here in England, from among themselves, subject to the Pope's ratification. Under that system we should at least have had the more moderate and enlightened party among the Catholics represented in their prelates. But now we are to have them appointed direct from Rome: from Rome, where the most narrow-minded and intolerant party is predominant. Look at Primate Cullen, whom the Pope has just inflicted on Ireland. It would be impolitic at first to send such benighted and benighting bigots to England; but it cannot be doubted that ultra-montane Catholics will soon be in possession of all, or nearly all, the Papal English Sees.

But say what you will about Bishops, what excuse can there be for sending us a Cardinal? Dr. Wiseman prudently holds his tongue about this. Of course it would be egotistical for him to speak too much about himself. It must be remembered that a Cardinal is one of the highest grandees of a foreign *temporal* Sovereign; as well as a dignified ecclesiastic. All the objections to the subjects of a foreign ruler bearing power and office here are aggravated tenfold in Dr. Wiseman's own promotion. An ordinary Catholic may (and we believe does) bear true allegiance to Queen Victoria, but we cannot understand how Cardinal Wiseman can help feeling under a superior obligation to Pope Pío Nono.

The time, too, at which all this has occurred, has been seemingly chosen with a view to parade the advancement of Catholicism most arrogantly, and to excite the anxiety of sincere Protestants most widely. The Tractarian traitors in our Church have been lately growing more and more active, and more and more presumptuous. The open converts from their ranks to Popery were numerous. We were told, and had reason to believe, that the secret converts who still lingered in our camp were more numerous still. The whole Tractarian party was, and is, justly regarded as Semi-Papistical. While things are in this state, a troop of Catholic hierarchs is suddenly organised, and sent among us, as it were to take possession of the fortress from the willing garrison. The Pope and his clergy, both here and abroad, put forth decrees and thanksgivings, and sermons, in which the coming conversion of England was spoken of, as if the land were an isle of savage heathens, in which an enlightened few were longing for the proclamation of their spiritual sovereign's creed. "Do you triumph, Roman? Do you triumph?" says *Othello*, and, in truth, the Romans and the Tractarians triumphed a little too soon. England is Protestant at heart; and legions of Puseys and Wisemans will try in vain to make her otherwise.

† In thus controverting Cardinal Wiseman's assertions, we have no wish to see him or his suffragans either indicted or mobbed. Let them alone. Enough has been said and done to convince them and their traitorous Tractarian allies of their error in thinking England ripe for Romanism. If the establishment of a rival hierarchy shame our own into a little more active Christianity, we shall have cause to rejoice at the appearance of the "Illustrious Stranger" among us. There is ample room for such competition. There is a wide and dense field of misery, ignorance, and vice, to the reformation of which the Romanist, the Anglican, and the Dissenter, may apply their energies, and where, in the practice of the virtues of their common Christianity, they may forget the evil passions of their sectarian distinctions.

THE CARDINAL'S OATH.

(From the "Spectator," Nov. 23, 1850.)

A great point in the theological controversy has been grounded on a persecuting passage in the oaths to be taken by Roman Catholic bishops at their consecration, and by cardinals on their receiving the *pallium*. In the lectures which, at the request of the Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, Dr. Cumming, the Presbyterian orator of Crown Court, has been delivering to immense audiences in the Hanover-square-Rooms, the oath was quoted from the "Pontificale Romanum." The persecuting clause reads thus—"Hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles Domino nostro, vel successoribus, pro posse persequar et impugnabo." So eminent an ecclesiastic as Dr. Wordsworth quoted this passage from the pulpit of Westminster Abbey itself, on Sunday the 3rd instant, with an emphatic translation of it for the more effective stirring of the heretical and schismatical Protestant mind, and an intimation that Cardinal Wiseman, having duly sworn to "persecute and make war upon heretics," might be expected to act accordingly. But all this appears to have been stated, whether by Dr. Wordsworth in the pulpit or Dr. Cumming on the platform, under a grand mistake. The terrible clause was expunged from the oath as administered to British ecclesiastics, by Pope Pius the Seventh, in April, 1818. Dr. Wiseman took the oath in its amended form when he was made a bishop in 1840; the recent bishops took, or will take, the same amended oath; and Dr. Wiseman, on receiving the *pallium*, took no oath at all, cardinals being exempt. These particulars are communicated in a letter signed "Francis Searle," of St. George's, Southwark; who assisted at the ceremony in which Cardinal Wiseman received the *pallium*.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ON "THE ROMISH AGGRESSION."

TO THE ARCHDEACONS AND CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF CANTERBURY.

I am much gratified by receiving the address of the Archdeacons and Clergy of my diocese of Canterbury, "protesting against the act of aggression upon our Church recently committed by the Papal see." I was well aware that the clergy of my diocese were animated by the same sentiments which have been so generally expressed by the Church of England concerning this extraordinary measure, and I have waited for your address, considering that it would afford the most suitable opportunity of declaring my own sentiments upon the occasion. You justly observe that the appointment of bishops to take spiritual charge of the several counties of England and Wales is in direct opposition to the statutes of a country which affirm that no foreign prelate or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction or authority within this realm, in which the Queen's Majesty, under God, is the sole supreme governor. "When a foreign potentate assigns particular districts of the realm to be ruled over by his episcopal delegates and nominees," he certainly assumes to himself a pre-eminence and power which is opposed to the spirit and purport of our law. We therefore have just reason to declare our indignation at the present invasion of our rights, and the assumption on which it is avowedly grounded, that our Protestant communion is unsound, and even heretical. But whilst we are indignant, we need not be surprised. All religion, whether false or true, must be in a certain sense aggressive if it is sincere, and it is the known characteristic of the Roman Catholic religion to be not merely aggressive, but encroaching, and to rest satisfied with nothing short of absolute domination. We shall therefore act wisely if we look around us and inquire whether any peculiar circumstances amongst ourselves may have caused the present time to appear to the Court of Rome a favourable opportunity for the movement of which we complain. Ten years have elapsed since I thought it necessary to warn the clergy of another diocese against the danger of adopting principles which, when carried out, tend naturally to those Romish errors, against which our forefathers protested, and which were renounced by the Anglican Church. The result has proved that this judgment was not harsh, or the warning premature; on the contrary, certain of our clergy, professing to follow up those principles, have proceeded onward from one Romish tenet and one Romish practice to another, till in some congregations all that is distinctive in Protestant doctrine or Protestant worship has disappeared. Other circumstances might be mentioned, such as the titles and precedence allowed to the Roman Catholic dignitaries in Ireland and our colonies, which have afforded some colour to the belief that a change had come over the spirit of our land, and that an act of Romish aggression might be ventured without risk of serious notice or national opposition. Happily, the event has proved that the errors were on the surface, and confined to few; the heart of the nation adheres to the Word of God, and rejects the traditions of men. Our first duty, therefore, in the present crisis is to retrace our steps wherever they have tended towards Romish doctrine or Romish superstition; and, whilst we appeal to the Legislature to protect our Church from foreign invasion, to be especially careful that we are not betrayed by enemies within. But another duty is incumbent on us, of still greater urgency. The corruptions of the Romish Church are very congenial to the human mind, and especially to the uneducated, unawakened mind. Amongst the population of our crowded towns and our remote villages, too many, unhappily, are little able to test the truth of any religion which is proposed to them by its only sure standard, the Bible. These may easily become a prey to teachers so subtle, so skilful, so insinuating as Romish emissaries are known to be. There is likewise a constant immigration from Ireland of men who have imbibed superstition from their cradle, and by companionship, or alliances among their fellow-workmen, are too likely to aid the exertions of priests and Jesuits, of nuns and Sisters of Charity. It becomes doubly necessary for the clergy to guard their people against this danger by every means through which scriptural knowledge may be diffused amongst them; acquaintance with the Scriptures is the sure defence against Rome. The laity must lend their aid and supply the means of adding to the number of clergy, together with a provision for household visitors and Scripture readers, without which it is impossible to make head against the ignorance and apathy of an untaught multitude. If the recent assault upon our Church should thus become the means of extending scriptural instruction, the measure which was designed for our injury may, under a gracious Providence, result in an eventual good. The enemy has shown that he considers we have a weak point. It is our business to strengthen that point, and guard it from attack; and not to allow the ignorance of any part of our population to betray them into the hands of Rome. The clergy who have addressed me may depend upon my using whatever influence belongs to the high office and station to which I have been called, to maintain her Majesty's "royal prerogative and title, and to assert the rightful claims of the Church of England." And I have full confidence that they, on their part, will never be wanting in their endeavours to render harmless any attempt which may be made to weaken or subvert the Protestant faith, of which they are the appointed guardians.

Lambeth, Nov 21, 1850

J. B. CANTUAR.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK AND HIS CLERGY.

TO THE CLERGY OF THE RURAL DEANERY OF DONCASTER WHO
SIGNED THE ADDRESS.

MY REV. BRETHREN,—I have received with great satisfaction your temperate and seasonable address. The opinions therein stated have my full concurrence. The indignation you feel “at the attempt now made by the Bishop of Rome to establish a complete Papal hierarchy in this kingdom,” appears to be almost universally felt. But the manly and courageous letter of the Chief Minister of the Crown will relieve us of much of our anxiety on that head.

I cannot state more exactly my agreement with the sentiment expressed in your third paragraph than by the following extract from a charge delivered by me to my late diocese, in June, 1845:—“We have good reason to believe that Christianity was first introduced into these islands by the labours of an Apostle, or of Apostolic men, and had made much progress, long before the missionaries of Rome ever touched our shores. And if, in the course of time, in ages of ignorance and darkness, our Church became so closely connected with her, and through her usurpations so subjected to her power, as to partake of her corruptions and her sins, at length the burden was too grievous to be borne, the bondage was broken and rent asunder, and our present purity of faith and practice was restored on the authority of God’s Word and on the testimony of the primitive fathers. Are you now, after three centuries’ enjoyment of freedom, to be again burdened with a heavy yoke which your fathers could not bear, and to be again brought under the tyrannous rule of one who ‘sitteth in the temple of God, exalting himself above all that is called God’—usurping a title and a dignity which cannot be proved to have any foundation in reason, in Scripture, or in historic truth? Against the multiplied and dangerous errors of Rome, our venerable Reformers testified unto death. Are we so degenerate as to be beguiled into the snare which her ever wakeful ambition is continually plotting for our captivity, entanglement, and ruin?”

It required, perhaps, no great reach of foresight to be able to predict the dangers that were approaching. They were foreseen and foretold, and the voice of warning was raised in various quarters against the sure and inevitable tendency of the Romanising spirit in which too many of our brethren in the ministry so freely and rashly indulged. You truly describe as “of exceedingly dangerous tendency, both to themselves and their flocks, their adoption of opinions and practices which are in conformity with those of the Church of Rome, and foreign to those of that pure and reformed branch of the universal Church so happily established in these realms.”

You next allude, in words of deep import, to the solemn oath taken at your ordination, as on other subsequent occasions, wherein you “declared your assent to the principles embodied in the Ordinal, Articles, and Canons of our Church—that the Queen’s Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor in this realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical causes as in temporal.” You are aware that some clergymen, in the unrestrained indulgence of their rights of private judgment, have narrowed the interpretation of the obligation under which they were bound, whenever and as often as they subscribed the three articles of the 36th canon, contracting its force and meaning within limits (to common apprehension) little accordant with the plain language of that canon and with its known purpose and object, as confirmed by the 2nd and 27th canons of the same year. No wonder, therefore, when our abjuration of all foreign pretensions is nullified by such a construction, that the Bishop of Rome, ever on the watch for regaining and re-establishing his ascendancy, should step in and claim us as part of his heritage; for it is an acknowledged rule of his Church, that not only those who submit to and continue in his communion, but all who, like ourselves, have long ago renounced and quitted it, are, nevertheless, still under his dominion. This is evident from the catechism published by order of Pope Pius V.:—“Non negandum, tamen, quia in ecclesie potestate sint hæretici et schismatici qui ab ecclesia deseruerunt, ut qui ab eâ in iudicium vocentur, puniantur, et anathemate damnentur.” The same doctrine is stated more recently in a celebrated work, “De Ecclesia Christi.” “Ecclesie suam retinet jurisdictionem in omnes apostatas, hæreticos et schismaticos, quanquam ad illius corpus non jam pertinent.” So that we are all accounted as part and parcel of that spiritual dominion which we have forsaken and abjured.

I rejoice, therefore, that you have entered your timely and “indignant protest” against this intolerable and usurped authority, and that you will not suffer yourselves to be again brought under its sway; and I cordially join with you in the hope that this “audacious movement of the Papal See will be overruled for good” by Him at whose disposal is the issue of all events, so that the true faith of the Gospel may continue and be universally held among us throughout all generations.

Believe me to be, Rev. Brethren, your faithful Friend and Servant,

T. EBOR.

At a meeting of the President and Fellows of Sion College, the following reply of the Bishop of London to the address from that body was read to them:—

“*Fulham, Nov. 5, 1850.*”

“REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,—I expected nothing less from the President and Fellows of Sion College than an expression of the indignation with which they regard the recent usurpation of authority by the Bishop of Rome, in pretending to re-divide the kingdom of England, which has formally rejected and cast off his tyranny, into new dioceses, and appointing new Bishops to preside over them, treating as mere nonentities the ancient Archbishoprics and Bishoprics of England, recognised as they have been by his predecessors, although existing independently of them.

“In order to avoid doing that which is forbidden in terms of the laws of our country, he has done that which is a palpable violation of the laws of the Catholic Church, even of that division of it over which he presides. ‘*Hæc est moderna Ecclesiæ descriptio*’ (says Van Espen) ‘*ut, et Episcopatum et Archiepiscopatum, sive Metropoleon, institutio, seu erectio, non nisi autoritate Patris, interveniente, tamen principis consensu, imofere non nisi id ejus postulationem fiat.*’ In fact, the recent proceedings of the Pope can be defended, even upon the principles of his own Church, only on the ground that this realm of England is *in partibus infidelium*, or that he treats us not merely as heretics or schismatics, but as unbelievers.

“You have justly designated this novel and presumptuous movement of the Court of Rome as a bold attempt to undermine and destroy our constitution in Church and State. The extension of Papal authority is as little compatible with the safety of the latter as it is with the independent purity of the former. None of the decrees by which former Popes have asserted a right of interference in the government of a country have been abrogated or disowned. All the offensive weapons of the Romish Church are suspended in her armoury, ready to be taken down and wielded when a fit season shall occur. The recent act of the Pope is virtually an interference with the Government of England, and ought to be denounced and resisted as such. ‘*As it is lawful,*’ says Bellarmine, ‘*to resist the Pope if he should invade our bodies, so it is lawful to resist him invading our souls or troubling the commonwealth.*’ ‘*It is of perilous consequences,*’ says Dr. Barrow, ‘*that foreigners should have authoritative influence upon the subjects of any power, or have power to intermeddle in affairs,*’—one of the wise observations so thickly strewn over that masterly treatise in which he has effectually destroyed the notion of the Pope’s supremacy.

“But it is for us, the ministers of a Church which, by God’s blessing, cast off the slough of Romish corruptions at the Reformation, to warn our people against this daring attempt of a foreign Bishop, as being an open aggression upon the purity of our faith and worship, and upon our religious freedom. Let us warn them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and ‘*not to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage.*’ Let us be careful to impress upon them the true nature of the differences that separate us from the Church of Rome, and the grounds upon which our own, as a true branch of the Church Universal, claims and merits their allegiance.

“If you are faithful to our trust we shall have no cause to fear. The light which was re-kindled at the Reformation, far from being extinguished by the emissaries of darkness, will burn more brightly still upon the Church or golden candlestick, and the people of England will rejoice more and more in its brightness.

“I thank you, reverend and dear brethren, for the assurance of your prayers on my behalf, and commending you to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, I remain your affectionate friend and Bishop,

“To the Rev. President and Fellows of Sion College.”

“C. J. LONDON.”

The Bishop of Exeter has made the following reply to an address presented to his lordship by the churchwardens and a deputation of lay members of the parish of the Holy Trinity, Exeter:—

“BROTHER CHRISTIANS, AND BROTHER CHURCHMEN,—I receive with great satisfaction the address which has just been read to me. The recent acts of the Bishop of Rome, affecting in direct contradiction to the canons of the Catholic Church, to place bishops in this land, which is throughout already occupied by an Episcopate nearly as ancient as that of Rome itself, cannot fail to have excited in every faithful member of Christ’s Church amongst us a feeling of indignation at its presumption, and a firmer resolution than ever to resist the unrighteous and un-catholic spirit which has prompted it.

“Whether this act be indeed, as you designate it, an ‘*aggression on the constitutional rights and sovereignty of the Crown of England,*’ after all the changes in our constitution which modern legislation has introduced, I do not pretend to say. If it be, it is manifestly the duty of the advisers of the Queen to take steps to vindicate the outraged rights and honour of their royal mistress.

“But perhaps there is too much reason to fear that the innovations which have been made within the last few years in our fundamental laws, have, in truth, removed all impediments to the intrusion of such bulls from Rome as that which is the subject of our present complaint. If this shall prove to be the case, it will become the people of England to blame their ow

culpable disregard of their highest interests, in spite of warnings repeatedly pressed upon them, rather than to indulge in furious but idle invective against the wary adversary who has turned their imprudence so largely to his own account.

"Be this, however, as it may, it is a branch of the subject on which it does not become me here to dwell. In Parliament, so long as it shall please God to give me strength to go thither, my voice shall ever be raised, as it always hitherto has been raised, however feebly and ineffectually, to assert the ancient principles of English law, principles which, so long as they were permitted to retain their force, were the security alike of the majesty of the Crown and the best interests of the people.

"But, out of Parliament, my duties are of a spiritual character. When called on, therefore, as I now am, to address a highly valued portion of Christ's flock, over which he has constituted me the pastor, I would confide myself to the religious aspect of the case before me. Looking at it thus, I cannot but invite you to discern, in the present occurrence, a new proof of the wise dispensations of God's Providence, overruling all the designs of men, and all the events in life, to the accomplishment of His own blessed purposes for the ultimate good of His Church, and a fresh call on us to use faithfully, and thankfully, the great blessing which He has bestowed on this favoured land, by planting in it a true branch of that Church, and placing over it, and empowering with His authority, in unbroken succession from the Apostles, those of whom the great Apostle of the Gentiles himself has commanded all Christians 'so to account, as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.'

"Human policy may be at a loss in dealing wisely and effectually with the out-breakings of Papal presumption, backed as it is by a powerful and pampered party, which has hitherto been suffered to preserve its course almost without control. But, there is one simple and sure way of securing ourselves against all our dangers. Be we faithful to our own Apostolic Church, be we in earnest when we call ourselves Churchmen, be we sincere in showing forth our sense of the value of that holy ordinance which, by God's bounty, we enjoy—your bishop feeling, as he ought, the lawful force of those special obligations which he incurred when admitted to his sacred office—the people testifying their reverence for that office—God's ordinance, I repeat, for their edification, not, indeed, by a blind and unreflecting, but by a ready, a dutiful, a confiding spirit of attachment to him who bears it—and then, I will not say we may laugh to scorn—for scorn is not a feeling which ever becomes a Christian—but we may view, with calm reliance on an Arm more powerful than man's uplifted for protection, the most daring displays of Roman ambition, revelling in the proud assurance of legal impunity—if our laws do, indeed, permit such doings to pass with impunity.

"Meanwhile, I must not omit one consideration which forcibly impresses itself upon me. Far be it from me to forget the demand of Christian charity, that we 'rejoice not in iniquity,' still we may rejoice, thankfully rejoice, in hoping that this shameless demonstration of the true character of Papal Rome will do much in awakening to a better, a more truthful mind, those amongst us who, feeling with distempered acuteness the fancied or the real deficiencies of our own system, may have been tempted to look with too much complacency to a quarter which henceforth no consistent, no true Catholic, can hesitate to regard as most schismatical.

"In conclusion, accept—what is worthless, indeed, to all who deem it worthless, but what will never be lightly valued by any who regard it as it is, the voice of any one who speaks, be he himself as unworthy as he may, with the authority of God's appointed minister—accept your Bishop's blessing. The Lord bless you, and keep you! The Lord make His face to shine upon you, and to be gracious unto you! The Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace—together with the Spirit of Peace—both now and evermore!"

The close of his lordship's address, the *Exeter Gazette* states, was delivered in the most emphatic manner, and was responded to with an audible "Amen" by those on whom the solemn benediction was bestowed.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells has issued the following letter to his clergy:—

"To the Reverend the Clergy of the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

"REVEREND BRETHREN,—You will have heard with feelings of shame and indignation (shame at an act so disgraceful to a minister of Christ, and indignation at the insult offered by him to the Sovereign and people of England), that a foreign Prelate—the Bishop of Rome—has taken upon himself to set at defiance the laws, constitutions, and recognised usages of the Church Catholic, by assuming to himself the spiritual jurisdiction of this kingdom, and by parcelling out into pretended dioceses of his own devising a country which has been ruled by its own bishops from the earliest period of Christianity.

"This most deplorable work of schism affects to transfer the episcopal charge of the county of Somerset from my hands to those of a pretended Bishop of Plymouth.

"Such an act calls for a prompt and decisive course of condemnation and resistance, as from the entire clergy and laity of England, so, on our own account, from those of this diocese.

"In such a course I recommend you to proceed without delay. I am never willing to advise the clergy to introduce controversy into their pulpits; but in a struggle for life or death (which this may prove), the physician must not shrink from unusual remedies; and therefore I must urge you, both in your public and private teaching, to bring the subject of this letter under the

immediate attention of your people, displaying to them at the same time the true character of the Romish schism, its pestilent errors, its unchanged and unchanging character of evil.

"I exhort you to take care that, as far as in you lies, your flocks, from the highest to the lowest rank, shall be instructed on these points; so that the humblest cottagers in our villages, and the youngest children in our schools, shall be made to understand both the nature of this recent act of Papal aggression, the injury intended to be inflicted on them thereby, and the dangers which threaten them.

"Having thus roused the attention of the whole Protestant population of the diocese, I would recommend you to invite them to join with you, first, in a solemn protest against, and an unqualified renunciation of, the intended and usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome; and secondly, in an urgent appeal to the Government of the country, to take such steps as shall vindicate the Queen's authority; as shall demonstrate that no foreign Prelate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within these realms; and as shall neutralise and render ineffectual the measures devised by the Bishop of Rome, and frustrate all his further attempts on our Church and State.

"Earnestly desiring your prayers, and earnestly praying for you, and for your flocks, that in these dark and dangerous days we may have light given us to see the course of duty, and grace to adhere to it unflinchingly, I remain, your affectionate brother in Christ, and Bishop,

"BATH AND WELLS.

"*Blithfield, Staffordshire, November 2, 1850.*"

The *Durham Chronicle* contains the address from the Dean and Chapter of Durham, to which the Lord Bishop replied as follows:—

"*Auckland Castle, Nov. 5, 1850.*

"DEAR MR. DEAN,—I have read the address of the Dean and Chapter of Durham with the purest satisfaction, as expressing, in language firm and moderate, the Protestant feelings of so many enlightened clergymen. It is scarcely necessary for me to assure you and your brethren that I entirely assent to every principle you have asserted, and every expression you have employed. Nor will any effort of mine, if called for, ever be wanted in an endeavour to check the arrogant and obtrusive spirit of popedom, and to assert the undoubted rights of conscience, as maintained by our forefathers at the Reformation, and transmitted to ourselves as the most precious birthright of Englishmen. I had much more to say upon this occasion, but the subject has happily been taken up by a more powerful hand. I am rejoiced to have an opportunity of stating here, I have this morning received from Lord John Russell an able and satisfactory statement of his opinions and intentions upon the subject, with full permission to publish it, if I think fit. I am, in consequence, about to communicate it to the press, because I am sure it is calculated to do much good, and to calm the minds of all who have been disturbed by the late unwarrantable assumptions of Rome. I feel assured that you will peruse this document with as much pleasure as I have done.—Believe me always, dear Mr. Dean, yours most faithfully,

"E. DUNELM.

"Very Rev. Dean of Durham."

CONTENTS.

THE "ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION."

FIRST SERIES—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the Two Letters to the "Times" by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the "New Batch of Bishops," from the "Weekly Dispatch;" Two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;" concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES—The Bishop of Northampton's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, November 2nd, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square-Rooms, November 7th, 1850.

THIRD SERIES—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the "Vatican Masquerade."

FOURTH SERIES—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the "Queen and the Pope."

SIXTH SERIES—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note from the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of "Catholicus;" Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic Explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

EIGHTH SERIES—will contain the conclusion of Letters from the Bishops, and a variety of other Articles.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

LETTER FROM JOSEPH HUME, ESQ., M.P.;
FOURTEEN LETTERS FROM BISHOPS OF THE ESTABLISHED
CHURCH;

DR. DOYLE'S SERMON, NOV. 17:
CATHOLIC BISHOP OF NEWPORT'S PASTORAL; AND
A LETTER FROM A CORRESPONDENT.

JOSEPH HUME, ESQ., M.P., ON THE PAPAL
AGGRESSION.

(From the "*Hull Advertiser*," November 22nd, 1850.)

Our readers will observe that the venerable patriot, who now may be regarded as the father of the House of Commons, estimates Lord John Russell's letter at the same value which we do. Mr. Hume sees in it a dexterous movement by which the retention of power is secured, and real reform postponed for an indefinite period. Lord John Russell cares no more for the Church question—properly so called—than we do; and most likely views with complacent contempt the manifestations of zeal which his letter has provoked. But his lordship cares a great deal about keeping out the Protectionists, and retaining in his own hands the reins of power. The following is Mr. Hume's letter:—

"Barnly Hall, Great Yarmouth, 18th November, 1850.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I cannot lay down the *Hull Advertiser* of the 15th inst., without offering some remarks on matters therein specially noticed.

"I approve of the manner in which you treat the Papal episcopal appointments, and show the danger to religious liberty by the proposed interference which many, perhaps all, of the addresses to the Crown would recommend.

"It is well for the clergy of the Church of England to pretend to be alarmed at the proceedings of the Catholics, in their nominal and voluntary distinctions; but, if the attempt of the Anti-State Church Societies be well considered, there will be more danger to the Established Church from them than from the Pope's Bull.

"The purpose so dexterously laid hold of by Lord John Russell, of throwing (as I stated some days ago to a friend) a tub to the whale, to stop the course of Parliamentary and financial reform for a time, will, I fear, be answered, and the relief I had hoped to be afforded to the country by timely reform be postponed. The Chartists decided the purpose of Lord John at a critical period, and the Pope will now do the same! How weak mankind are!

"It has been stated, and I fear with truth, that Lord John Russell and his lady have been of the party who have followed Mr. Bennet, of Pimlico, in all his Puseyite and Romish principles and practices, even to the very verge, as Lord John says, of Popery; and, therefore, it wears a suspicious appearance in him now to turn round, among the first, to blame the internal traitors to the Established Church, he having, by his example and proceeding, given encouragement to that section of the Puseyites, and been one of their leaders.

"I can understand why the clergy of the Church, who have neglected those duties (as so clearly shown by Sir Benjamin Hall in the case of Wales), may be desirous of raising an outcry of 'The Church in danger from the Pope,' to divert public attention from the real danger from the neglect and incompetency of the clergy within the Church.

"Your view of the subject will be adopted as soon as the thinking part of the public can get their eyes opened to the real merits of the alleged innovation. I say alleged, because Mr. C. C. Greville has shown that the Pope is warranted in all he has done, by the proceedings of Sir R. Peel's Government, which were not at the time objected to by any person except by Sir Robert Inglis and his limited class.

"I remain, yours sincerely,

"E. F. Collins, Esq., Hull."

"JOSEPH HUME.

Eighth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution. [James Gilbert 49, Paternoster-row.

Of whom may be had "*The Roman Catholic Question*," Nos. I. to VII., and IX

LETTERS AND REPLIES FROM BISHOPS OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

Palace, Ripon, November 7, 1850.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—You do me no more than justice in believing that I willingly receive at all times the expression of your sentiments on those subjects which are of general interest to the Church or the diocese; and I desire to assure you that, on the present occasion, I entirely sympathise with you in the feelings of indignation which you have expressed at the attempt recently made by the Bishop of Rome to establish a schismatical hierarchy in this kingdom, in violation of one of the canons of a General Council of the Universal Church.

It is in vain to plead an excuse, as has been attempted, that this act does not essentially differ from the former practice of the See of Rome, in appointing Vicars Apostolic for this country, to attend to the spiritual interests of the members of the Church of Rome within it. The present proceeding, as one of the accredited organs of the Roman Catholics has just confessed, is a public declaration in the face of Christendom that the Church of England is no Church at all; it is a denial of the existence in England of any spiritual jurisdiction save that of the Pope, it abrogates the authority of all existing sees, and pronounces invalid all acts proceeding from the Bishops of the English Church who occupy them; it transfers the primacy of Canterbury to the new Archiepiscopal See of Westminster; it substitutes the See of Southwark for that of London, and the See of Beverley for those of York, Ripon, and others, by virtue of the usurped prerogative of an universal Bishop.

Has the Bishop of Rome forgotten that one of his predecessors, whom he must deem infallible, branded such an assumption with the epithets “profane, blasphemous?” Has he forgotten the confident assertion of Pope Gregory the First, in the sixth century, when the Patriarch of Constantinople attempted the like usurpation, that “whosoever doth call himself Universal Bishop, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation *forerun Anti-Christ*, because he, pridingly, doth set himself before all others?”

We might, indeed, be inclined to pity the blind infatuation which leads that foreign prelate to imagine that the Reformed Church of England is preparing to retrace her steps, and again submit to the usurpation and errors of the Church of Rome; we might smile at the delusion of those dreamers who fondly fancy that there is a prospect of union between them while Rome persists in clinging to her abominations, and be tempted to pass over this act of absurd arrogance in silent contempt. But we dare not do so, lest our silence should be construed into consent; lest we should be supposed to acquiesce in the pretensions which the Bishop of Rome has now put forth in a form on which he has never ventured since the Reformation.

The occasion seems to me to require that we should, each in our several spheres, proceed to deal with this proceeding as it merits; and I rejoice to receive from you the emphatic assurance of your firm resolution to adhere to the principles of the English Reformation, by maintaining the integrity of our Church, in its Protestant as well as its Catholic character; and I shall readily comply with your wishes, by offering you such suggestions as appear to me to be fitting in the present emergency.

In the first place, I should recommend that protests repudiating this usurped supremacy, now practically assumed for the first time since the Reformation, should proceed from the clergy and laity of every parish in the diocese, as a permanent record of their resolution to resist this act of foreign aggression.

Next, I should advise that petitions be addressed to both Houses of Parliament, craving that a statute may be passed, forbidding all, save those by law authorised so to do, from assuming or using the title of any archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery, now existing or hereafter to be created, derived from any place within these realms. This will be a fresh indication of the royal supremacy on the part of the Legislature of this country, and will serve, I should trust, to quiet the consciences of those who might otherwise feel a difficulty in taking the oath in favour of it, so long as the Legislature seemed tacitly to acquiesce in the Papal assumption.

I need hardly add, that, in your own parishes and districts, the utmost vigilance will be requisite in ascertaining what attempts are being made to tamper with the faith of your people by the emissaries of Rome. You will then be able to judge for yourselves how far it may be necessary to meet these aggressions by instruction from your pulpits on the points of controversy between the two Churches; by the distribution of tracts setting forth the errors of the Church of Rome; and by yet more diligent visiting from house to house, that so you may in every way labour to drive away those erroneous and strange doctrines which the head of that Church is now especially bent upon inculcating.

I believe that he has miscalculated the effects of the step he has just taken; and that it will result in a more firm adherence on the part of the people of this land to those pure and unadulterated truths of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which our forefathers vindicated in protesting against the corruptions of Rome; while it leads many who have been inclined to regard that Church with too favourable an eye to acknowledge that her spirit is unchanged, that it is impossible to acquiesce peaceably in her pretensions without betraying the cause of their own Church, and consenting to the destruction of which the idle sentence has now been launched forth against her.

That some such reflections as these may tend to unite all the members of our own Apostolic Church in the bonds of firmer attachment to her, and of brotherly love to each other, is the sincere prayer of your faithful and affectionate brother,

C. T. RIPON.

The Rural Dean and Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Leeds.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has replied to an address from seventy-four of the clergy and deanery of Bristol, complaining of the presumptuous appointment of a Bishop of Clifton by the Pope. His lordship writes:—

“MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—I beg to assure you of my sympathy with the sentiments which you express on the surprising presumption of the Bishop of Rome in erecting a See of Clifton, with a jurisdiction extending over the whole of this diocese.

“Perhaps I ought, in candour, to disclaim any feeling of sorrow on the occasion, being sincerely of opinion that this attempt to grasp at spiritual sovereignty, by parcelling out England and Wales into Romish Bishoprics, will have the effect of opening the eyes of our people to the real character of the Papal system, and removing all notion that it had reduced its pretensions, or modified its spirit of domination.

“The brief itself, in *perpetuam rei memoriam*, which comprises this act of pretended power, exhibits in glaring colours the characteristics of a corrupt religion, and will, in all succeeding ages, bear a prominent figure in the annals of the Papacy. It terms the Reformation, when by the Church was purified from doctrines and practices which had no warrant in Scripture, ‘The Anglican schism of the sixteenth century,’ speaks of ‘consoling the Church of England for its immense disgraces;’ and that no doubt may exist of the nature of the worship which the new hierarchy is to introduce into this country, it twice speaks of the invocation of ‘the mother of God and the blessed saints, the patrons of England, whose virtues have made England illustrious.’

“That the present act is schismatical there can, I think, be no doubt. That it is also an outrage upon the Queen’s prerogative as supreme head of the Church seems to me evident. Should you view it in the same light, I see no reason why you should not humbly address her Majesty, with assurances of your determination to maintain her rightful prerogative, and petition Parliament to pass such laws as may be necessary to protect the royal supremacy from similar invasions.

“As you desire my counsel and direction in this emergency, I feel myself bound to declare frankly, and without reserve, my conscientious opinion as to the course of conduct most likely to unite the hearts of the whole community in love and affection for our pure and apostolical branch of the Catholic Church. Select associations of clergymen for effecting particular objects of improvement in our institutions, however good their views may be, cannot fail to cause agitation and disquiet, prejudicial to the general spirit of our commission, and will be found in practice rather to secularise the clerical character, and to produce disunion among our brethren.

“One more piece of advice I cannot refrain from suggesting. No one can help perceiving that the daring step which the Pope has been advised to take owes its origin to the recent instances of persons educated in the faith of our Church having abandoned its worship for the doctrines and practices of Rome, and still more to the introduction of a few obsolete forms and ceremonies into some of our churches, which, though indifferent in their nature, are generally thought to bespeak favour and inclination to Romanism. Indeed, the Papists themselves avowedly ground their presumptuous hopes upon those desertions and those practices. The instances of converts to Romanism, though individually to be deeply lamented, are still not sufficient in number or character to cause alarm to the Church, or triumph to its enemies; but the fact that some of them had, before their desertion, practised and recommended similar alterations in the forms of our Protestant worship, has caused uneasiness in the minds of a large portion of the laity, and tends to diminish confidence in their spiritual guides; a result in every way to be deplored. That the practices which have caused this alarm have arisen in most cases from the warmth of pious and devotional feeling, and that they are consistent with abhorrence of the idolatrous parts of the Romish system, I firmly believe. Nevertheless, no person can fancy that he is obeying the calls of duty when overstepping the injunctions of his Church, while the evil consequences are too palpable. I therefore take this opportunity of earnestly and affectionately cautioning you, one and all, against such things as tend to a suspicion, however ill-founded, of your approving the peculiar habits and practices of Romanism. Believe me to be, with esteem and regard, your affectionate friend and brother in the Lord,

“J. H. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

“Stapleton, November 6, 1850.”

TO THE REV. W. B. OTTER (RURAL DEAN), AND TO OTHERS, THE CLERGY AND LAITY RESIDING IN AND NEAR COWFOLD.

REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN, AND DEAR BRETHREN IN CHRIST,—The address you have presented to me affords me much comfort and satisfaction. Humbled as we may feel that the Pope of Rome should have deemed this country open to his arrogant pretensions, we must

yet naturally derive consolation and support from the unanimity with which his unchristian intolerance has been rebuked, and his tyrannical attempts rejected.

The audacious aggression has, indeed, only served to show how firm and unmoved is the Protestant heart of our beloved country. We beat back his futile assumption with the indignant declaration that we are Catholic and he schismatical; that we are true to our pure Apostolic Reformed Church, and will admit neither the corruptions of the faith nor the degrading superstitions and practices which Rome has engrafted on primitive Christianity; that we are loyal to our Sovereign, and will maintain her rightful supremacy against him and every other usurping claimant whomsoever. We tell him that our Church and nation enjoy, by God's blessing, the free, unrestricted use of God's holy word; that for ourselves and our posterity we will never surrender that sacred inheritance into his hands, or into those of any archbishops or bishops deriving a pretended jurisdiction over us from his baseless, unscriptural authority; and, finally, we bid him prove himself in truth a minister of God's word by opening it to those over whose minds he now tyrannises by closing it against them, and by submitting himself and his pretensions to be judged by what is there written.

We remind him that for three centuries we have appealed, and we avow our trust that ere long all Christendom will learn to appeal, from the Bishops of Rome to God in His own word. We are as confident as he is fearful that then will there be a speedy end to his arrogant and vain assumptions. Nor need any one fear that unity will suffer; on the contrary, it will be promoted by the restoration of the Church at large to the freedom in which it was at first nursed. Independent national Churches will, as in the earlier centuries, ascertain each for itself the warranty which Scripture gives for the fundamental articles of the faith, and so combine to hold and transmit them pure and untainted as the Church of those earlier days sent them onwards towards us.

Christendom, disabused of the errors which now bind so large a portion of it in slavery to one man, will live, not in pilgrimages to imaginary relics, nor in a vain terror of a purgatory unknown to Scripture and antiquity, but in the light of a free access to God for pardon for sin through His blessed Son, and through Him only who ever liveth to make intercession for us. That light is truth; communion in Christian truth is union and unity in Christ. Error impairs that union and consequent unity in proportion to the intensity of the error; and if it be of so malignant a nature as to rob God of the honour and worship due to Him alone, by exalting a creature to intercept and retain it, except as that creature shall be pleased to pass it on to Christ, or the Father, or the Holy Spirit, can union with Christ, which is the foundation of the unity of his followers in Him, co-exist with such an error—with such apostasy from the truth?

Finally, my brethren, let us be earnest in prayer, that we may not be led, in defending our own religious liberty, and the truth which we hold so dear, to forget the charity which we owe to others—even to those from whom we most differ. We may defend ourselves from this aggression of the Bishop of Rome, and yet cherish a brotherly desire for the spiritual and temporal welfare of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and all others of that persuasion. We are told they pray for our conversion to the form of Christianity they profess. Let us not be wanting in conduct so truly Christian; but, remembering the precept, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. x. 12), while we pray humbly and earnestly to God that He will enable us to walk stedfastly in a pure faith, "in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life," let us also pray that He will be pleased to enlighten our Roman Catholic brethren, and enable them to throw off the errors in which they are now entangled.

Committing you to the grace of God in our Lord Jesus Christ, I remain, Rev. and dear brethren, and dear brethren in Christ,

Your affectionate friend, and, as

I humbly trust, faithful bishop,

Palace, Chichester, Nov. 19.

A. T. CICESTER.

An address having been presented to the Lord Bishop of Oxford from the clergy of the deanery of Woodstock, "protesting against the recent assumption of authority by the Bishop of Rome, in claiming spiritual jurisdiction in this realm," and "earnestly requesting his lordship to suggest such measures as might seem most fit to be adopted in the present crisis," his lordship has been pleased to return the following answer:—

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 13.

"MY REV. BRETHREN,—I have this day received with great satisfaction your reasonable address upon the recent aggression of the Bishop of Rome, in pretending to divide our land into dioceses, and appoint to them intrusive bishops. Against this insolent assumption, which denies at once our holding any place in the Holy Catholic Church, and our being an independent nation under the lawful supremacy of our Queen, it is our duty to protest as subjects of the Crown of England, and as being, through God's mercy, members of a reformed branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.

"To the spiritual claims of this corrupt and doneigning communion, we, my Rev. brethren, will never, God helping us, with His holy word in our hands as our guide, and the Primitive Church before us as our example, yield place by subjection—no, not for an hour.

"This new assertion of its old claims by the Roman See should lead us, first, to instruct our

flocks with more earnest diligence at once in those great truths which our fathers re-asserted at the Reformation, and which must utterly part those who hold them faithfully from the deep and unchangeable corruptions of the Papacy; and also in the greatness of the blessing vouchsafed to them in their belonging to a Church which, of God's mercy, is at once pure in its doctrines and apostolic in its origin; and, secondly, to renew solemnly our protest against the unscriptural doctrines and unfounded claims of the Roman See. For this purpose, I have invited the clergy of the diocese to meet me at Oxford on Friday week.

"The insult offered to our Queen and nation has, I fear, been invited by a policy which in Ireland and in our colonies has acknowledged similar appointments. But we may hope from the professions we have recently read, that such claims will now be firmly resisted by her Majesty's Government. As to this, I advise you to maintain a careful watch. Professions, however loud, will not suffice. We need acts. We would give the fullest religious liberty to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, but we would not allow their ambitious Pontiff to thrust in his claims to exercise a foreign jurisdiction in our land; and if the law, as it at present stands, be found too weak to guard this jewel of our Crown Imperial, I would suggest to you the duty of petitioning for such enactments as may be found necessary to preserve our land from such foreign intruders.

"That in this, and in every other hour of trial, you may be guided and strengthened by our God and Saviour, is the earnest prayer of your affectionate brother,

"S. OXON."

The following address has been presented to the Bishop of Winchester:—

"To the Right Rev. Charles Richard, by Divine permission Lord Bishop of Winchester.

"We, the undersigned clergy of the diocese of Winchester, resident in the Isle of Wight, approach your lordship with renewed expressions of reverence for the sacred office you sustain, and of attachment for the paternal spirit in which its duties are administered.

"These feelings have received an additional impulse from the aggression which has been recently made by the Bishop of Rome on the functions of that sacred office, in their exercise in this diocese.

"We, for our part, hasten to avow our unshaken and inalienable submission to your lordship as our diocesan, and our readiness to follow your godly admonitions on this as on every other occasion.

"That occasion it is which prompts our present appeal.

"The supremacy of our Sovereign and the jurisdiction of our bishop have been alike invaded, and our allegiance to both impels us to resist the invasion.

"And in this resistance we are persuaded we shall have the sympathy and cooperation of our several parishioners.

"They, equally with ourselves, will gladly receive the indication of any constitutional mode of opposition which your lordship may suggest, and we pray the great Head of the Church so to guide the counsels of our spiritual and temporal rulers, that, in opposition to those who would turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction, the throne of our Sovereign may be established in righteousness, and the Church of our land rendered a praise on the earth."

St. Asaph, Nov. 15, 1850.

MY REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,—I am rejoiced to find that the views regarding the proceedings of the Bishop of Rome taken by yourselves, and the country generally, correspond so fully with those which I have myself been led to entertain.

As to the attack made on the civil power of England by thus partitioning the kingdom into new bishoprics, you have done most wisely in addressing yourselves to her Majesty, and promising that fidelity with which every loyal subject will resist any endeavour to lessen the authority of the Crown.

With respect to the schismatical attempt thus to treat a country which may probably owe its Christianity to the times of the Apostles, and of which it is hardly too much to say that we believe the See of Rome to be older than any of those in Wales chiefly because Rome lies geographically nearer to Jerusalem—an attempt to treat as if lying "in partibus infidelium" a Church as ancient as their own, it is only necessary to state the facts of the case in order to expose it, not merely to the just indignation of every British Christian, but to the wonder and amazement of all those who are acquainted with the first principles by which Christian societies have always regulated their intercourse with each other. For I believe that I may say with truth that an attempt so utterly contrary to the regulations of the Universal Church was never before made.

There is, however, a lesson which we may all learn from this invasion of our Church and its just rights. Whenever men guided by worldly policy, and forgetful of the rules of Christian charity and apostolica regulations, attempt to invade systematically the rights of others, they will soon find themselves deceived in their calculations, and blindly hurried into steps which can only end in overthrowing their own projects.

The Church of Rome will, I trust, discover that this act of theirs has awakened amongst us a spirit of Christian watchfulness and zeal for our own Church, which they have treated as if it had no existence.

And if in His mercy the Almighty destines a blessing to flow to us from this unprovoked act of hostile aggression, His gracious purpose will be accomplished by raising up among us a spirit of brotherly union and of Christian exertion. May we, one and all, rally round the Throne to protect the rights of our Church and of its earthly head.

May we meekly seek the aid of Him who will never desert us, and be built up in our most holy faith and

in Christian love, so that we may each perform our several duties with more fidelity and zeal, and find an end of those divisions which have heretofore weakened our strength in a cordial and energetic endeavour to serve God with sincerity and holiness, and to honour our Queen, to whom He has committed the temporal government of His Church.

I have the honour to be,

Your friend and Diocesan,

To the Rev. the Rural Dean of Llanrwst.

THOMAS VOWLER ST. ASAPH.

The Bishop of Worcester has made the following reply to an address from the minister, churchwardens, and sidesmen of the parish of St. Thomas, Birmingham:—

“GENTLEMEN,—I am much obliged to you for the address which you have transmitted to me on the part of a public meeting of the inhabitants of St. Thomas’s parish, Birmingham, assembled to consider the late aggression of the Pope upon the authority of our beloved Queen, and the independence of our apostolic Church.

“The expression of the sentiments which that address contains is the more valuable to me, as evincing the strong Protestant feeling which prevails among the laity in so important a portion of my diocese; and so long as this feeling continues to prevail among the people of this country, we may view with more indignation than alarm the insults of a fourth-rate power, whose own throne is maintained only by the support of 12,000 French bayonets.

“I entirely agree with you that the Pope has been encouraged to commit this act of insolent folly by the tendency to Romish observances which has unfortunately been evinced by too many of our clergy; but I am satisfied that he will find himself much mistaken, and that, however some few may have been induced by Jesuitical casuistry to apostatise from our pure and apostolic Church, the great majority of both High and Low Churchmen will concur in vindicating the independence of our Church and the supremacy of our Queen.—I am, gentlemen, your obliged and faithful servant,

“H. WORCESTER.

“Hartlebury Castle, Nov. 15, 1850.”

The Bishop of Chester has made the following reply to an address from eighty-four of the clergy of his diocese:—

“Chester, November 2.

“MY DEAR ARCHDEACON,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of an address, signed by yourself and a very numerous body of the clergy of Liverpool and its neighbourhood, in relation to the recent Papal edict.

“The mild spirit of toleration in this country has given to the members of the Roman Catholic Church the free exercise of their religious faith, and, so far as respects the internal form of government within their own communion, there would probably be no desire on the part of others to interfere with it. As long as the Pope was contented to provide for the episcopal superintendence of the congregations of Roman Catholics in this country by means of Vicars Apostolic in the mode hitherto practised, the proceeding might be regarded as intrinsically confined within the pale of the Romish Church.

“But the recent edict from the Papal See advances a loftier pretension. It makes a partition of the realm of England into new created dioceses, over which bishops are appointed to exercise spiritual government. This is apparently intended as a demonstration, reaching beyond the scanty members of the Roman Catholic community, and affecting to cover with its influence the whole realm. It treats our Established Church as a nullity, and pretends to take possession of the country as a spiritual waste. Such pretensions will be met with fairness, and reduced to their proper level. We may confidently rely that, so far as the occasion may require, our Government and Legislature will take effectual care that the royal supremacy and the national independence shall not suffer either detriment or indignity. We need not entertain any fear for the consequences. The Church of England, appealing to the inspired volume of Scripture as the standard of its faith, will not now relapse into the errors which at the Reformation it renounced, or again bow to the yoke of spiritual assumption from which it was then freed. The Bible is in the hands of our people. It is in the Bible, God’s word, not in the Papal letters sent from Rome, that they will look for the rule of their obedience and the foundation of their trust.

“The part especially pertaining to ourselves is to labour that, through the blessing of God’s grace, we may be faithful ministers of that word in its simplicity, its purity, its truth; exerting individually all our efforts, in our respective sphere of duty, in the public services of divine worship, in the pastoral visitation of the people, in the religious education of the children of the poor; acting with union and concert among ourselves; marking plainly and uncompromisingly the broad line that separates the Churches of England and Rome from each other; upholding strenuously the supremacy of the Queen and the principles of the Protestant faith; yet still preserving the spirit of Christian charity towards those whose pretensions it is our duty to resist.

“If you and the rest of the clergy shall join in a declaration expressing your devoted loyalty to our gracious Queen, and your zeal for the maintenance of the royal supremacy and of the rights of the Established Church, you will have my cordial sympathy. And I beg you will assure the clergy of my affectionate regard; and I remain always truly yours.

“J. CHESTER.

“The Venerable Archdeacon Brooks.”

The Bishop of Lincoln has returned the following answer to the clergy of Nottingham, Stamford, and Lincoln, who have addressed his Lordship upon separate occasions upon the subject of the late Papal aggression:—

“MY REV. BROTHERS,—I lose no time in replying to the address which has been transmitted to me by your Archdeacon, and in which you protest against the recent act of the Bishop of Rome. In that protest I cordially concur. I can regard the act in no other light than as a gratuitous insult offered to the Crown and to the branch of the Catholic Church established in this part of the United Kingdom; to the Crown because, by the ancient British constitution, the Pope, as Archbishop of Canterbury, and as assigning the territorial jurisdiction over the British Isles, arrogates to himself a supremacy which is up his own supremacy in England; to the Church, which, by our constitution in Church and State, is vested in the Crown; to the Church

because, by declaring that he does this act in virtue of the power vested in him by Jesus Christ of governing the Universal Church, he declares that the Church of England, which does not recognise the existence of any such power in him, is not a member of the Universal Church. I call the act a gratuitous insult, because it cannot be pretended that it is necessary, in order to insure to the members of the Romish communion residing in this kingdom the free exercise of their religion; that freedom they have now for many years fully enjoyed; this act is, therefore, done by the Bishop of Rome not in the assertion of their claim to liberty of conscience, but of his own to spiritual dominion. I repeat, then, that I cordially concur in your protest.

"But you crave my counsel and advice at this critical juncture. I advise you, therefore, in the first place, respectfully to represent to the Legislature the violence done by this act of the Bishop of Rome to the consciences of all the clergy, and of such of the laity of the Church of England as are required to take the oath of supremacy. In taking it we declare that "no foreign prelate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within her Majesty's dominions." Yet we now see a foreign prelate parceling out the country into dioceses, appointing a bishop to each, and defining the limits of his jurisdiction. If this be not to exercise authority, I know not what is. I think, therefore, that you are bound to represent to the Legislature the contradiction between the terms of the oath and the fact, and so call upon it to declare the letter recently issued by the Bishop of Rome illegal, as being opposed, if not to the express letter of the statute, yet to the spirit of the acts under which the members of the Established Church are called to take supremacy.

"In the second place, I would hold up to you, for your guidance at this juncture, the conduct of the able, and learned, and pious men who in the reign of the Second James, when the Bishop of Rome entertained the hope which he appears now to entertain, of speedily subjecting this realm to his spiritual dominion, fearlessly maintained the cause of the Church of England. They in their discourses from the pulpit, and in their writings, drew the attention of the people committed to their charge to the points in dispute between the two Churches, and satisfied them by sound argument that the Church of England is in possession of the truth. They appealed, and appealed successfully, to the understanding of the people. Let us not doubt that the same success will, by the blessing of God, attend our labours, if we give them the same directions—if from time to time we make the disputed points the subject of our discourses—if we temperately, and without exaggeration, expose the erroneousness of the Romish tenets, and call upon our congregations to join us in protesting against them.

"Let it not be objected to me that I am counselling you, instead of preaching that which directly conduces to the spiritual edification of your flocks, and their growth in personal holiness, to lead them into the barren and intricate paths of controversy. The blame must rest with him who imposes this necessity upon us; the Bishop of Rome leaves us no alternative, he compels us to be controversial. But, my Rev. brethren, whilst we protest against this act of the Bishop of Rome, let us seriously ask ourselves whether we have not ourselves given occasion to it; whether he has not been encouraged by the unhappy divisions prevailing amongst us to deem the present a favourable moment for thus presumptuously re-asserting his claim to spiritual dominion over this realm. Let us join in beseeching Almighty God to awaken us to a just sense of the danger to which we are exposing the cause of pure religion by our internal dissensions, and to remove whatever may hinder us from godly union and concord. Let us beseech him to give us by the teaching of His Holy Spirit a right judgment in all things, and so while we stand fast in the liberty wherewith at the Reformation we were made free, we may be preserved from converting that liberty into licentiousness; and while on all occasions we are careful to show that we hold holy things in reverence, we may be preserved from allowing that reverence to degenerate into superstition.

"I remain, my Rev. brethren,
 "Your faithful friend and brother in Christ,
 "J. LINCOLN."

Bangor, Nov. 18.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of the address which you have forwarded to me from yourself and the clergy of the Deanery of Arustley.

I fully concur in the sentiments which you express on the arrogant pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, and the attack which he and his Council have recently made on the independence and honour of our National Church, and the constitutional prerogative of our Sovereign.

Hitherto that prelate has been contented to superintend his adherents in this country through the agency of his vicars or vicegerents. He has now taken on himself to parcel out this kingdom into territorial divisions or dioceses, erecting into sees certain cities and towns within her Majesty's dominions, and giving charge over them to men of his own nomination, bound to him by an oath of fealty, assigning to them titles of distinction, and the exercise in his behalf of a jurisdiction which no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate hath, or ought to have, within this realm. You, my Rev. brethren, need neither advice nor encouragement to resist any attempts that may be made by the agents and instruments of this prelate, and of the corrupt branch of the Christian Church which professes subjection to him, to seduce the sheep of your flock from their communion with our reformed Church and the principles of our Reformation. You will resist these attempts in a spirit of Christian charity, and zeal tempered with discretion. You will agree with me in considering that Reformation as a signal work of God's providence and grace, and will bless Him for having delivered us from a yoke which our fathers submitted to with reluctance and bore with impatience. That God may prosper your endeavours to maintain the faith of the Gospel in purity and truth, and to minister to the salvation of the people committed to your charge, is the prayer of your affectionate and faithful friend and brother,
 C. BANGOR.

The Rural Dean and Clergy of the Deanery of Arustley.

A meeting of the clergy of the archdeaconry of the East Riding of York was held at St. Mary's national school-room, Beverley, on Nov. 20, 1850, in pursuance of a requisition numerously signed, to take into consideration the recent Papal encroachments.

Beverley gives a title to one of the Roman sees just created. It possesses all the features of a cathedral

city, and this probably has been the cause of the honour conferred upon it in its selection as the seat of Roman government for the county and district of Yorkshire. The splendid old minster, founded by the celebrated St. John of Beverley, is not inferior in architectural beauty to the finest of the cathedral churches. The charities of the town are ancient and considerable; there are marks of age and of consideration in every quarter; the venerable structure of St. Mary's church, which is supposed to have owed its first existence to Archbishop Thurston, vies with the minster in massiveness and in age (Mr. Pugin, moreover, is assisting in its restoration); and the whole spirit of the place, in fact, is in accordance with the traditions of the Roman Catholic clergy.

Archdeacon Wilberforce, to whom, as the Archdeacon of the East Riding, the requisition had been presented, did not attend, and the following letter was read in explanation of his absence:—

“Burton Agnes, Nov. 19.”

“MY REV. BRETHREN,—Having discharged my public duty by calling you together, you will allow me I am sure to act myself according to my private opinions. I conclude that the measures at present contemplated must result, if they have any result, in an abridgment of that liberal indulgence hitherto extended to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. Now I retain the conviction, which I have frequently expressed, that it is unwise in the civil magistrate to impose restrictions upon the religious liberty of any class of his subjects. I still believe, as I stated to you in 1845, that ‘the principle of toleration, however paradoxical in theory, is in practice adapted by God’s providence to the circumstances of the world,’ and consequently that ‘those who, like myself, believe it most favourable to the development of truth must desire to see it carried out in its extreme latitude.’ However, then, we may dislike the principles or practices of those who dissent from us, I cannot ask for the renewal of restrictions which I thought it wise to withdraw, nor do I regret

“That even our enemies,
Tho’ forging chains for us, themselves are free.”

“These considerations, however, would not prevent me from meeting you to-morrow, were it not for the vents of the present year. The civil power has this year assumed that office of settling matters of doctrine which our formularies assign to the Church, and which the Church, in my opinion, cannot surrender without relinquishing rights which were bestowed upon her by Christ our Lord. The first decided exercise of this novel power by the temporal authority has been to determine that an article of the creed is an open question, which the clergy are equally at liberty to affirm or deny. I am aware that many excellent men do not take the same view of the injury which has been inflicted upon us, being influenced, as I believe, by an amiable unwillingness to admit the real evils of the case. I will not reiterate the arguments which I laid before you in my last charge, but I refer to them, as explaining why I cannot take part in any address which may be designed to vindicate the Church’s rights from other dangers, so long as this capital grievance remains unredressed. To do so would tend, in my judgment, to encourage the opinion that we acquiesce in the position in which we find ourselves, and are ready to pass to the consideration of other subjects. Under these feelings, I think that I shall most further the unanimity of your proceedings by abstaining from any interference in measures in which I should be unable to participate.

“I remain, Rev. brethren, your obedient servant,

“ROBERT I. WILBERFORCE.”

“To the Rev. George Wray, and the other clergymen who requested
the calling a meeting.”

The reading of the letter was marked by general silence among the seventy clergymen present.

The following reply has been made by the Bishop of Salisbury to an address from the clergy of the archdeaconry of Wilts:—

“Bighton, Nov. 11, 1850.”

“MY DEAR MR. ARCHDEACON,—Having received various addresses from different parts of my diocese, on the subject of the late Papal aggression, and being aware that others are in course of preparation, it appears to me advisable to express my sentiments on the subject generally to you and the other archdeacons of my diocese, and through you to the clergy and laity of your respective archdeaconries, requesting them to receive this expression of my opinion as a general reply to addresses on this subject, unless any particular circumstances should call for a more specific answer.

“I wish, in the first place, to assure you that I fully respond to the feeling which has led both clergy and lay members of the Church in my diocese to think it suitable on this occasion to address themselves to me, as to one set, in the Providence of God (unworthy as I am of such a post), over this portion of the Lord’s heritage; and, therefore, both called upon, in any difficulty, to give counsel, according to my ability, to those placed under my charge, and also bound, under the most sacred engagements, to be foremost in maintaining the pure doctrine of our holy faith and the integrity and rights of that branch of Christ’s Church of which we are ministers. Nor is it to be denied that both these are alike assailed by an act which is at once a schismatical assault on the very existence of our Church, and a direct invasion of the rights of our Sovereign, as supreme governor of this realm.

“But while I thus recognise the just occasion which is given for feelings of indignation by this aggression, I am glad to believe that I may rather seek to moderate and restrain such emotions than to excite them; and may endeavour to allay apprehensions as to the consequences of this act which, if not unnatural, are yet, I believe, unfounded and unnecessary.

“I would, indeed, recommend you, in the first place, to join in a firm protest against this unwarrantable assumption of authority by the Bishop of Rome. By such a course the hands of our Sovereign will be strengthened in repressing, by the power of existing laws, if these be found sufficient for the purpose, this assault upon the catholicity of our Church, and the dignity and prerogative of the Crown. And should it prove that the present state of the law does not sufficiently provide for this case, it will then be fitting to petition the Legislature for such an amendment of the law as may vindicate the position of our National Church, and prevent all foreign interference with the rightful authority of our Sovereign.

“Anything else than this it does not appear to me to be necessary to recommend. It, indeed, you have reason to believe that the minds of any of your people are disturbed by the artful suggestions which are

now so industriously spread abroad by the emissaries of the Church of Rome, this will be a sufficient reason for endeavouring, with redoubled vigilance, to guard them against such assaults, and for exposing the errors and the superstitions with which that corrupt Church has overlaid the simplicity of the faith. But, without some such reason, I should be unwilling to advise you generally to trouble the peace of our quiet villages by potential agitation, or to stir up the bitter and muddy waters of controversial strife.

That the hopes which have prompted this daring aggression will end in anything else than the disappointment of its authors I utterly and entirely disbelieve. The people of England are assuredly not disposed to take upon themselves again the yoke of a foreign bondage, or to accept as articles of faith doctrines incapable of proof from the word of God, and unsupported by the practice of the first ages of the Church. And, however we may lament that some among us have proved faithless to the trust committed to them, and that in some few quarters a tendency may manifest itself to approach too nearly to the system of the Church of Rome, do not let us either ourselves imagine, or, by vague and general charges or insinuations, lead others to suppose, that this evil is more extensive than it really is. As regards our diocese, I can appeal with confidence to you to confirm the expression of my own certainty that there is not any reason for alarm in this respect. If there be differences among us, we are willing to refer the decision of these to the rightful authority of our Church in the interpretation of the word of God. If there be evils requiring remedies, for these also we are content to strive with patience and with hope. And, in the mean time, be these evils what they may, we are not disposed to seek a refuge from them in returning to those errors and to that bondage which at the Reformation our forefathers shook off.

Commending you to Him who is able in all troubles to comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work, I remain my dear Mr. Archdeacon, your faithful and affectionate servant and brother,
 "E. SARUM."

The Bishop of Lichfield has replied to an address from the clergy of the archdeaconry of Stafford in the following letter:—

"Eccleshall, November 14, 1850.

"**REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,**—I beg of you to accept my sincere and respectful thanks for your earnest and affectionate address.

"I rejoice that you have come forward to protest against the recent daring and unprovoked aggression of the Pope of Rome (who 'hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England') upon the independence of our Church and the supremacy of our Sovereign; plainly recognised as this is both by the common and statute law of the land, and by the canons and articles of our Church.

"I agree with you in regarding this intrusion as a virtual denial of our orders, and an insult to our office; for it can no ways be reconciled with acknowledgment of the one or reverence for the other.

"How far it may be necessary to meet this act of Papal usurpation by any legal measures, it will be for her Majesty, with the advice of her Council, and, if need be, with the concurrence of her Parliament, to determine.

"But I feel, with you, that this matter is to be looked at from higher ground than that of merely civil or ecclesiastical considerations. I feel, with you, that the spiritual welfare of the people is deeply concerned in it. I am free, however, to confess that I have no fear lest, by such an aggressive movement as this on the part of the Church of Rome, her own corrupt standard of faith and worship should be re-established among us. On the contrary, I have a good hope that we shall hereby be led to look more closely at the principles of the Reformation, and so to maintain them more intelligently and more firmly; to be more deeply thankful for the evangelical purity and the apostolical order of our Church; more careful not to depart from the simplicity of her service; and more anxious for that unity among ourselves upon which, under God's blessing, our strength so mainly depends. If this be so, we may humbly trust that the gracious Providence which reformed, and has so long protected, our Church, will continue to be with it under every trial to which it may be subjected.

"If it should seem good to our Metropolitan to convoke the Bishops to take council together upon this very important occasion, I need not say that I shall feel myself bound to obey the summons. That the clergy at large will be ready to support, and carry into effect, any determination which may thus be formed, I have full confidence.

"I thank you heartily for the expression of your kind feelings towards myself, and I desire to join with you in prayer to the Giver of all grace for blessing upon our ministry.
 "J. LICHFIELD.

"The Venerable the Archdeacon and the Reverend the Clergy of the
 Archdeaconry of Stafford."

The Bishop of St. David's has made the following reply to an address from the clergy of the Denery of Castlemartin:—

"**REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,**—I have received, and have read with great satisfaction, the address in which you have expressed your sentiments on the recent act of Papal aggression. I warmly sympathise with the feelings which it has excited in you, and which I am glad to see prevailing throughout the country; though my surprise has been in some degree tempered by reflection on the invariable character and policy of the See of Rome, as well as by the recollection of recent circumstances which have probably contributed to nourish its ambitious hopes and to animate it to this new enterprise. Still it is both startling and saddening to find that, even to minds blinded by the credulity of hope, it should have appeared that England has now become ripe for the re-establishment of that foreign dominion which it cast off at the Reformation.

"It has afforded me great pleasure to observe that the expression of your feelings is accompanied with a declaration that you 'do not desire anything at variance with those principles of religious toleration which form a part of the British Constitution.' I hope that none of us, but especially that none of the clergy, will be provoked by the recent insult to breathe a wish for the infringement of those principles. I cannot even now regret the removal of those disabilities under which our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects formerly laboured. But if I approved of the measures which have been at various times adopted for their relief, it was not because I ever placed the slightest confidence in the moderation or good faith of the See of Rome,

or of the Romish priesthood in this country, nor even because I could ascertain the limits of its influence over the laity of its communion; but simply because I believed that we were strong enough to dispense with those safeguards which our ancestors, while fresh from a perilous struggle in defence of their civil and religious liberties, very naturally deemed necessary for their security. Still I think that no part of the recent bull will or ought to sink deeper into the minds of those Protestants who have befriended the Roman Catholic claims than that in which allusion is made to the 'falling off of the obstacles which stood in the way of the (Roman) Catholic religion.'

"But those principles which, with myself, you desire to see preserved inviolate do not appear to me to require that we should quietly submit to the aggression which has been now attempted by the Pope. The indignity offered to the Church of England when it is treated as a nonentity, or rather when its name is transferred to the Pope's adherents in this country, need not, I think, move any stronger feeling than one of contemptuous pity. It is only a fresh example of that wilfully blind intolerance without which the Papal usurpation, having no basis in truth or justice, could not maintain itself. How far the power assumed by the Pope of establishing a new hierarchy of bishops deriving their titles from our great cities and towns, and of parceling our land into new dioceses, affects the prerogative of the Crown, and whether such titles may be lawfully assumed under the authority of a foreigner by English subjects, these are questions which deserve, and I doubt not will receive, the gravest consideration from those who are better qualified to pronounce upon them. I will only observe that the language employed in the bull seems as if it were studiously framed to convey the idea of an absolute sovereignty claimed by the Pope over the kingdom of England, and would have suited the time of King John as well as the reign of Queen Victoria. If, however, it should appear that the law in its present state does not meet the exigency of the case, then there will arise a further question for the wisdom of the Legislature to decide—whether it be not expedient to provide some new enactments to repel this aggression, and to guard against similar encroachments for the future. I am glad to see that the First Minister of the Crown has already declared his sentiments in terms which seem to afford a pledge that her Majesty's Government will be ready to adopt such measures as may appear requisite for vindicating the dignity of the Crown and the independence of the nation.

"In the meanwhile it will be our duty, dear and Rev. brethren, to await the issue of this crisis in a spirit of calm watchfulness, but of earnest resolution. I think it is clearly incumbent on the clergy, wherever their flocks are threatened with the infection of Romish error, diligently to resist its progress by exposing those corruptions of doctrine and practice against which our Church bears witness in her Articles and Liturgy, and more particularly by laying bare the hollowness of those pretensions which have been recently put forward in such an extravagant and offensive form. Where, as is happily yet the case among us in this diocese, there is no apparent reason to apprehend any immediate danger of such a kind, it may hardly be advisable to depart from the course of our ordinary teaching by a frequent reference to controversial topics. For you it will probably be sufficient that you should continue to feed your flocks with the sincere milk of the word, and to mould their hearts and minds, especially those of the young, in that form of sound doctrine which is the glory and strength of our Church. I would not, however, be understood as if I meant to dissuade from exercising the common privileges of Englishmen by joining with the laity in addresses either to the Crown or the Legislature for the attainment of any object which the occasion may seem to you to require. But this is a matter which I would rather leave entirely to your own discretion.

"Commending you and your work to the Divine blessing,

"I remain, Rev. and dear brethren,

"Your faithful and affectionate brother,

"C. ST. DAVID'S."

An address has been presented to the Bishop of Winchester by forty of the clergy of the Rural Deanery of North Ewell on the subject of the recent appointment by the Pope, in which they say, that they are anxious to be guided by his lordship's experience and godly advice as to the best mode for them to proceed; and that they would fain have his sanction for appealing to their parishioners to join with them in strongly protesting against this invasion of their spiritual rights and this bold attempt to rob them of their own holy religion, and also in humbly petitioning the Queen and her Ministers to exert every means in their power in order at once to repel this usurpation. The following is the reply.

"Farnham Castle, Nov. 12.

"REV. AND DEAR BROTHERN,—I have much satisfaction in acknowledging the address which has reached me through the hands of your rural dean, subscribed by forty of the clergy of the Rural Deanery of North Ewell, and protesting against the recent measure of the Roman Pontiff.

"You express a confidence in my willingness to advise with you on the steps proper to be taken for counteracting the evils you justly apprehend from this movement on the part of Rome, and I readily respond to your desire for conference and counsel, in full sympathy with the feelings by which you yourselves are actuated.

"Had the present attempt of a foreign prelate to establish territorial jurisdiction in England been received with cordiality, or even with indifference, by the great body of our countrymen, I should have felt that serious and well-grounded alarm might have been reasonably entertained. The purity of our faith might have been endangered, and the principles for which our ancestors successfully contended at the Reformation might have been again placed in jeopardy.

"But I have an assured confidence—which events from day to day serve only to strengthen—that we have no reason to apprehend the prevalence of indifference or of a lukewarm spirit on this subject. By the blessing of God, the pretensions of the Papal See find no response within this realm. England seems ready to declare, with an almost unanimous consent, that she still protests against the errors renounced by the voice of the nation when this country threw off the yoke of Rome; and testifies, in a manner which cannot be mistaken, her steadfast adherence to the doctrines of our apostolical Church, and her acknowledgment of her paramount claim on the belief and affections of the people.

"I cannot hesitate, however, to express my opinion that opportunity should be given for manifesting these feelings, which unquestionably are deeply seated in the hearts of the great mass of the community,

in such an open manner as will be intelligible, not only to the country at large, but to the Church of Rome herself.

"I advise, therefore, addresses to the Queen, and petitions to the two branches of the Legislature, from all your parishes. You may legitimately call upon your people to remonstrate against what you truly characterise as a 'violation of the laws and constitution of this country,' and an 'invasion of the Queen's supremacy;' and you may pray for such a remedy as may appear most effectual for preserving inviolate the honour of the Crown, the liberties of the country, and the best interests of our holy religion.

"You remind me that, on former occasions as well as in my recent charge, I have called your attention to what seemed to me the pressing dangers from the spread of Romish doctrine. I am encouraged by this allusion to repeat my earnest advice, that you should carefully avoid even the appearance of underrating the fatal influence of the errors of Rome, either by omitting to denounce them faithfully or openly, or by seeming to make light of her corruptions, or affecting an approach to the peculiarities of her worship. The duty of separation from her communion, as well in external forms as in vital doctrine, which made the Reformation necessary, still presses upon us as forcibly as ever. And if, in times like the present, this duty be neglected, or imperfectly discharged, we must not be surprised if the true character of our ministries is called in question, and the soundness of our faith exposed to natural, if not to just, suspicion.

"I commend you heartily to the grace of God, and remain,

"Rev. and dear brethren,

"Your very faithful friend and brother,

"C. WINTON.

"The Rev. R. Tritton, Rural Dean of North Ewell Deanery, and
the other subscribers to the address."

To our Very Reverend and Reverend Brethren of the Clergy, Secular and Regular, of the Dioceses of Newport, &c., and the Diocese of Shrewsbury; and to our Beloved Children in Jesus Christ, the Faithful Laity of the said Dioceses—Health and Benediction.

We had proposed, as well as others of our Episcopal brethren, to delay our formal announcement of the restoration to England of her Catholic hierarchy until we should receive the apostolical briefs appertaining thereto. But the popular delirium throughout the length and breadth of the land compels us to anticipate our purpose, in hope that the voice of calm reason may be powerful in arresting such wide-spread hallucination. Sure we are that, as civilised Europe actually gazes, with astonishment and disgust, upon the delusions successfully propagated amongst our countrymen by artful and wicked men, so, of those who are now taking part in the rabid outcry against the recent acts of the Sovereign Pontiff, many will, ere long, blush at the remembrance of their folly. We may even confide, from examples of the past, that, to the wild passions which are agitating the land a reaction will succeed, favourable to the progress of Catholic truth, as from the stirring up of the pool of Bethsaida the healing of diseases followed.

What, indeed, is it that has worked up such violent hostility and alarm? Again and again has the public been assured that the act of the Supreme Pontiff is one of spiritual authority merely—an act which might have been expected to be welcomed by the opponents of our religion—an act such as is known to have been repeatedly exercised, without remonstrance or offence.

It is an act of spiritual authority exclusively, whether the means whereby it is enforced be regarded, which are not carnal weapons nor human power; or the object whereto it is directed, a mere substitution, for the former absolute dependance of our clerical institutions upon Rome, of our present less dependant condition under Bishops in Ordinary. Whilst, indeed, we were but a small body, kept down by cruel persecuting laws, and therefore anxious to escape public notice, an extraordinary mode of Church Government best suited our condition, namely, government by a small number of Bishops bearing the title of Vicars Apostolic, and delegated by the Chief Bishop, and successor of the Prince of the Apostles in the only surviving Apostolic See, to represent his solicitude for all the Churches. This, however, was naturally a transition state, and known to be such by those who reflected thereon. So soon, therefore, as Catholic emancipation had freed us from those tyrannical laws which will be pointed to by future ages as the greatest disgrace of England, and when, through whatever causes, our numbers had largely increased, and with them the places of divine worship wherein we might celebrate our solemn rites according to the ceremonial of the Catholic world, a natural consequence, which every reflecting mind must have foreseen, was that the number of our Bishops would have to be proportionally augmented, and their anomalous condition and title abandoned for those by which Catholic Bishops are preferably recognised in despotic Russia and Prussia, in republican America, in our own Colonies, in almost every civilised State.

In reality, we know that, heretofore, the fact of English Catholics being governed in spirituals by Vicars Apostolic was a matter of reproach and apprehension. "What are your Bishops," people said, "but mere creatures of the Pope—dependant exclusively on his will, and therefore bound to execute its every direction under penalty of instant deprivation? Give us for your Bishops Englishmen, having freedom of action, such as in other countries Bishops possess, and these will afford us greater security against Papal aggression." Such language was not infrequently heard, and it had a show of reason. This, then, is precisely what has been recently done. And, lo! what a clamour is now raised against it; what absurd fears are sought to be enlisted by interested and unprincipled men, anxious by rousing angry passions in the fleeting masses to avert attention from their own dissensions in matters of belief; nay, seeking a pretext to gratify their intolerance and bigotry by re-enacting, if possible, the penal laws against that portion of their countrymen who, since receiving emancipation, have proved themselves neither worse subjects nor worse neighbours, but whose religious creed, freed from the mass of calumnies heaped upon it with impunity during centuries of oppression, is now appealing too successfully to candid and upright minds, and winning over many to its security and consolations.

The Bishop of London, however, discovers that the Pope has exceeded his jurisdiction; that he has no right to appoint Metropolitan and Diocesan Bishops; and that by his late act he has confirmed himself in schism. No wonder such language proceeds from a Bishop of the Establishment, whose spiritual existence is derived from the State alone, whatever some may inconsistently pretend; and who therefore, if he would

not stand self-condemned, must condemn all that claim independence of State appointment. But "the kingdom of Christ is not of this world" (John xviii. 36). Pastors and teachers were instituted, and directed to convey the tidings of Revelation to all nations, without applying to Tiberius. Neither was the concurrence of a Caligula, a Claudius, or a Nero solicited or needed, when Peter founded the Churches of Antioch and Rome, when Paul ordained Bishops for Ephesus and Crete, when James established his see at Jerusalem, nor when the other Apostles (by authority to which he alone succeeds who is the successor of the Chief of the Apostles in his see of Rome, as he is the sole remaining representative by unbroken descent of any Apostolic see) consecrated Bishops in every nation to which they bore the doctrine of salvation. It has been pretended, that this independence of temporal rulers occurred when Church government was established amongst heathens only. But the argument derived from Apostolic practice recognises no distinction of civil government, so far as the inherent rights of the true Church to spiritual independence is concerned; and therefore, if the Church itself sometimes consents to forego a greater or less portion of those rights, it must be only by her own free act. Moreover, the pages of ecclesiastical history are manifestly adverse to such a plea. How repeatedly, when many of the Roman and Greek Emperors supported those who maintained the errors of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, &c., did the Supreme Pontiff, invoked by the appeals of metropolitan and provincial synods, deprive of their right to spiritual power heretical Bishops, though upheld by all the power of the State, and replace them by Bishops holding His communion, and thereby commanding the spiritual obedience of the people! How often in our English history did our most glorious Bishops, a Wilfred, an Anselm, a Thomas à Becket, a Thomas of Hereford, and others distinguish the spiritual authority of the Pope from the rights of their monarchs, and appeal to the former against the latter, in what regarded their episcopal office and jurisdiction? Little did St. Innocent I. doubt the authority of the Holy See to establish, independently of princes, the sees of Bishops, when he wrote to Decentius, in 416:—"It is manifest that, throughout the whole of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the interjacent islands, no one erected churches except those priests who were appointed by the Venerable Apostle Peter, or his successors." Further, those Anglican Bishops, who are so loud in their condemnation of the Holy See, have been justly called upon to show by what title the Queen of England could, with their concurrence, commission Bishops to take charge of English Protestant interests in Jerusalem, Malta, in France, even in Italy and Rome. We, indeed, see in the violent, inconsistent, and ignorant outcry, a manifest though most reluctant admission of the vitality and authority of the Holy See.

We know that many have been so far blinded by the mists of prejudice and ignorance, spread designedly before their reason, as to be persuaded that the Pope is sending a host of foreign Bishops amongst them. Should we condescend to say that the same individuals hold the Catholic episcopal office in England who have long held it, having merely a change of name, without any present or, perhaps, early addition to their members; all of them well known in their respective localities, respected, we fear not to say it, by those who know them, and justly considered incapable of encroaching beyond the limits of the spiritual duties which they owe to their Catholic children in Christ?

Wherefore, then, do we welcome the restoration of our hierarchy in terms of congratulation and thanksgiving? We cannot do better than borrow the language of that pastoral letter which has been misconstrued into grave offence, through forgetfulness that it is addressed to none but members of the Catholic Church, who had just as much acknowledge his title to jurisdiction, when Vicar Apostolic, as they have now when he is Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Because our "beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of Catholic communion. Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the celestial firmament, from which its light had long vanished, and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted union round the centre of Unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light, and of vigour." Surely we may put forward our belief as matter of joy and gratitude; and if this boon of the Sovereign Pontiff dawn upon us the world's malediction, or the world's persecution, ought we not to cherish it more affectionately and thankfully, drawing hope from the opposition always made by darkness to light, and remembering that when, in the fulfilment of prophecy, the world shall say every evil thing against the followers of their calumniated and crucified Master, his magnificent promises ought to fill them with courage and joy, for their reward shall be great in heaven.

In this spirit we appoint that on Sunday next, the 17th inst., this letter be read in each church and chapel of the diocese of Newport, &c., and of the diocese of Shrewsbury; and that, after the principal Mass, the Te Deum be said or sung, in English or Latin, followed by the prayer, "Deus ejus misericordie," &c., and the prayer for the Queen, "Quiesmus," &c.

Also, that the Collect, &c., "Pro gratiarum actione" be recited in every Mass on the aforesaid Sunday and two following days. In the diocese of Newport, &c., the Collect, &c., for living and deceased benefactors may be omitted on those days.

Brethren, pray for us. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen. (1 Thess., v. 25, 28.)
Clerk-stew. Nov. 11th, 1850.

THOMAS JOSEPH, O.S.B.,
 Bishop of Newport, &c., Administrator of Shrewsbury.

DR. DOYLE AT ST. GEORGE'S CHAPEL.

The anticipation that the newly-appointed Cardinal Archbishop would take the earliest opportunity of making public his sentiments with regard to the prospects and position of the Roman Catholic Church, attracted an overwhelming audience to St. George's Chapel, Southwark, on Nov. 15th, 1850; some hundreds of whom were unable to obtain admission, although in not a few cases large sums were offered to obtain that end. The Cardinal, however, neither officiated nor delivered a sermon, nor in fact was he in the chapel at all. The Rev. Dr. Doyle, who preached, taking his text from the parable of the mustard-seed, proceeded nearly as follows:—In the sermon which was preached by me last Sunday week some words were

used which the public have been led to misunderstand. When, upon that occasion, I said, with reference to the Catholic Church, that "the days of her greatest glory were the days when she was steeped to the lips in blood," I by no means intended to convey the impression which has been placed upon it by the public journals. I did use those words, and I would again ask, was it not so, that the days of her glory were those when to her lips she was steeped in blood? Yes, I repeat that her glory was when her martyrs shed their blood to uphold her heavenly doctrines; and I rejoice to think that there are now, as of old, those ready to die in her defence if occasion should require, and to yield themselves up a sacrifice as freely as those who by their sufferings have shed a lustre upon the Church. It was in that light that I used the words, and not in the sense that the public have been led to understand by those who are ever ready to malign the pastors of the Roman Catholic Church. If acts have been committed—acts of oppression and persecution—in the name of the Church, let it not be said that I meant that the days in which those acts were committed were good days for the Catholic Church. No, those days were never the days of her glory. Let the persecutions of those days be attributed to the guilty parties who occasioned them. Let the blood be upon those that shed it, and not upon the Church, for those were the acts of men and not of the Church, whose maxims are charity, mercy, and love. My words have been bandied about at public meetings, and a wrong construction has been put upon them. That which I meant has been misinterpreted, and the public have been led into angry feeling by the way in which they have been explained. I will again repeat, what my calumniators know well to be the truth, that what I meant was the glorious days of the Catholic Church were when she was called upon to shed her blood in defence of her sacred truths. Why, she has done so in our own days. There are members of the Church whose blood has been shed for the Church, not indeed in Christendom, but they have died for the Church in China. I very much deplore, dear brethren, having to stray so far from the subject of my address as laid down in the text; but there are occasions which call for something like an explanation, and upon such an occasion as the present something must be said to disabuse the public mind of that which has been said of our Church, and said, too, by those—I will not mention names—who ought to know better. God forgive them! Amongst other things, they have spoken of an oath which they assert every cardinal upon his appointment takes before the Sovereign Pontiff. They have told the public that an oath of a terrible description has been taken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and that oath has been published in the journals. I will not repeat the words of that terrible oath, for no doubt you have all read it, and the less said about it the better; for from this sacred spot I declare that the accusation is a falsehood—no such oath has been taken by his Eminence. It has been commented upon at public meetings and in the newspapers, and the public mind has been thus inflamed against the Roman Catholics. It has been even said that the Cardinal had to take that oath at the footstool of the Pontiff. I declare there is no oath of the kind taken at all; and to say that there is, is to utter a base calumny like all the others which have been circulated by designing men. But I will give you the very words of his Eminence with respect to this oath that he is said to have taken. You will hear them from other lips in a short time, for the Cardinal will be here himself in the Advent; he would have been here to-day, but there are certain ceremonies to be gone through necessary to the installation which precludes his Eminence from officiating at present. I can assure you that his Eminence is not hiding from the public. But with regard to this terrible oath, I asked the Cardinal all about it. The very first words I addressed to him were, "Now, your Eminence, what about this dreadful oath?" His answer was, "No such oath was taken." That is the explanation I have to give. So much, then, for the calumny of the enemies of our Church. I would they had offended in ignorance, for it is lamentable to find those who know the truth throwing it aside, and, to advance their uncharitable purposes, stating the contrary. There is no truth whatever in the statement made regarding this oath. There is an oath taken by a bishop, but there is no such oath taken by a cardinal. Let me inform you what the oath taken by a bishop is. He promises in that oath to pursue and combat error, and to uphold the sacred doctrines of the Church. Surely it is not a dreadful thing to swear to combat error: for if to combat error be a dreadful deed, how many sins have not the members of the Church of England, and those who dissent from that Church, been guilty of? Are they not daily combating against what they call the errors of our Church, and do they not combat and pursue those supposed errors most zealously, and, as they believe, most conscientiously? Well, if it be a terrible thing on our part to pursue and combat error, are we worse than they? What are those who differ from our Church doing now? Are they not—and I will give many of them credit for their honest intentions—are they not daily, at public meetings and in their pulpits, combating what they term the errors of Popery? and not only combating them, but pursuing those supposed errors with a zeal amounting to something even more reprehensible than unfairness? Are they not by every means in their power, under the name of combating error, denouncing us and holding us up to execration? Oh, do they pause to ponder for a second upon our relative positions; do they ask themselves a question as to the justice of their proceedings. Alas, they do not pause. They believe that they are right, and in the assurance that they are so they not only combat but pursue us with the most unchristian vindictiveness. Well, we must, while we deplore such proceedings, give those opposed to us—I mean the great majority of them—the credit for sincerity of purpose; and as for those who know how unjust their denunciations of our motives are, let us pray that they will live to repent the wilfulness of their errors, which repentance, dear brethren, will be to us the greatest atonement for all the injuries done us. I am certain of this much, that many of those who now abhor us in consequence of the misrepresentations made by those in whom they place implicit reliance, will sooner or later regret that they should have been so misled; and can we wonder at the spirit of intolerance displayed towards us when we find that history itself—garbled history—has been still more perverted and tortured in order to paint us in colours distasteful and offensive to the minds and prejudices of conscientious Protestants? The acts of men and parties have been brought against us as acts of the Catholic Church. The reign of Queen Mary has been pointed to as one fully proving the Catholic Church to be a persecuting Church. Why, I ask, are such periods of history pointed at unless we are to have the truth? Why is it that the acts of men in the reign of Queen Mary should be held up as the acts of our Church, when the very men who take upon themselves to denounce us purposely avoid giving the Protestant multitude in this country the truth of the matter? Is it history they quote? and, if so, is it history honestly quoted? I know they quote history, that is, a portion of history; but they omit the portion

which would set the Catholic Church right with regard to the acts of men. They talk of the edict of Queen Mary, and lay it at the door of the Catholic clergy. I deny that that is true, and I refer our detractors to that history which they so wilfully pervert. What is the fact with regard to this very edict of Queen Mary? And, now that I may presume many Protestants are present, let me impress upon them the justice of paying attention to what I am about to state. Now, the true version of Queen Mary's edict, in connexion with the Catholic clergy, is this: on the very day that that edict was sent forth, that great and good and fearless friar, Alphonze de Castro, when he preached before the Court, in the presence of her Majesty, denounced it as most intolerant, unjust, and in every degree opposed to the glorious principles and spirit of the holy religion. That fearless man, in the name of the Church, denounced the acts of many as opposed to the Church; and it is the same Church now as in the day that De Castro defended it against the acts of those who were sinning against it. How, then, is the Church answerable for the persecutions, as they are called, of those days? Now, for argument sake, let us suppose that the oath said to be taken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster really was taken, where is the bishop that could carry it out? No such oath exists, save in the minds of those who, in their blind zeal against the Church, would, if necessary, concoct more terrible oaths to prejudice her amongst Protestants. A great outcry is raised against us on the ground that we assume to a temporal power in this country, in so far as temporalities are connected with the Church. I entirely deny it. I most solemnly deny it. The strength of the Church is in her poverty and unworldliness. God forbid that the Church should have worldly motives, for they who would take worldliness to the altar would be doing that which was not only opposed to its sacredness, but utterly destructive of its true interests. No doubt, brethren, the strength of the Church is in her poverty, her privations, her sufferings, and, like the grain of mustard-seed that escaped the dangers of the winter blast, so shall she survive the angry passions that gather round and, like a troubled sea, threaten to engulf her. She will escape all those dangers that encompass her, and as that small grain of mustard-seed sprang up into a goodly growth, so shall be the power and glory of the Church. Let it not be said, then, that we as a Church expect to flourish through wealth and persecution, for our history proves otherwise. Oh! if we had not true Christian charity, might we not be led to revile those who detract us? We leave them to God. No, ours is not a persecuting Church. They who say so are themselves our persecutors, for what is the Protestant Church doing this very morning, but denouncing us to their congregations as idolators, to be shunned, despised, and detested? I should not have been led to advert to these denunciations, but from the fact of those clergymen of the Protestant Church combating us not by argument but by detraction, and in such a spirit of intolerance as to point us out for persecution and to excite the people to acts of violence. Unable to recur to the laws of olden times to keep us in painful bondage, they have recourse to indirect means, knowing that England could never sanction the revival of those laws. Such a revival they know would be opposed to the very nature of a generous people. This is not the age for persecution. Thank God, England, above all other countries, enjoys freedom of conscience; and whilst the Catholics offend not against the laws of the land, and do nothing worse than preach charity and goodwill among men, I have no fear whatever. If we offend against the laws, seize us; but if we obey the laws, persecute us not, for you have no right to interfere with our conscience. If our opinions are opposed to the laws of England, punish us; but if otherwise, why are we to be marked out for destruction? Much stress has been laid upon my words regarding the possibility of the Archbishop of Canterbury ceasing to be a prelate in this country. I repeat every word of that. I say that the day may come when there will be no Archbishop of Canterbury, but I do not say that he will cease to be in consequence of any measures of our Church. Why, in England dissent from the Established Church is increasing rapidly every day. Members of the Protestant Church were in doubt as to the construction to be put upon the Sacred Volume, and they left the Church because they knew not where to have those doubts cleared up. They cannot look to the Archbishop of Canterbury to satisfy them, and they consequently leave the Establishment and take their own views of the question. This, if anything can, must do away with that title; and when the time comes when there shall be no State Church—and come it must, seeing that there are as many sects in this country as there are towns and hamlets—then must the Archbishop of Canterbury cease to be, for the Protestant religion, as recognised by the State, would no longer exist, and of course no Archbishop of Canterbury would be required. With regard to the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and his arrogant assumption of power over the temporalities of this country, let me tell you that his Eminence, so far from assuming power and grandeur, is a poor and humble man, whose income is scarcely sufficient to maintain his position as a bishop of a Church, whose self-denial in worldly matters is undeniable. My brethren, don't mind the insults heaped upon your religion by those who dare to denounce the glorious ceremonies of a Church as old as civilisation itself. Let them be called "mummeries." Don't be offended at the audacity of the man who dares to call them so: for those in whom you place confidence will sacrifice everything, even to life itself, in defence of those great, magnificent, and heavenly ceremonies. What our detractors say cannot destroy that which you value. You may feel that it is dreadful to hear those portions of your service, which you value as necessary to your salvation, denounced as meaningless mummeries; but we must bear all such insults with patience, bearing in mind that in proportion as the Church suffers so shall she shine until the glorious radiance illumine the minds that, in their darkness, are turned to injure her. I say to those who now insult and calumniate us, and I say it in all charity, let them take care how they judge us, let them take heed to the hereafter, lest when they meet those whom they have persecuted upon the right hand of their Heavenly Father, they themselves, if they repent not, be cast aside.

At the close of these remarks the Rev. gentleman proceeded to advert to topics more immediately springing out of the portion of Scripture selected for the sermon, comparing the Church of Rome to the grain of mustard-seed, and prophesying her ultimate mighty growth and triumph.

A FEW WORDS TO THE MEN OF ENGLAND, THE UPHOLDERS OF LIBERTY.

(From a Correspondent.)

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN,—It is a standing proverb that Englishmen are fond of fair play. In this Catholic question do not, I pray you, be led away by interested parties, and let the proverb die. Be still fond of fair play. Give your opponents a fair hearing. If Protestantism is that glorious truth your clergy tell you it is, it can brave the brunt of any argument. If it is not, "Seek ye the truth."

At the various meetings called by rich rectors and unwise churchwardens, no Roman Catholic has been allowed to speak; no defender of the faith, although an opponent of this measure, has been allowed a hearing. Why is this? A pickpocket may plead his own cause, may defend himself; a conscientious Catholic may not. Is this justice? Protestants who speak so much of "the Bible" know that "ought but justice can never prevail."

Now I want to ask you, my fellow-countrymen, What is all this uproar to any of you? Mind, I am speaking to the laity of England. Interested persons tell you, If the Cardinal is allowed to remain, England will, by-and-bye, become Catholic. How absurd, how ridiculous, how aldermanish an argument is this! Before England can become a Catholic country *two* mighty events must take place. Our beloved Queen must become a Catholic, and a Protestant people allow her to govern, or the whole nation must become Catholic, and compel a Protestant Queen to resign the throne. Now let me ask you, Can any of you be made Catholics against your will? Do I not insult your understanding by putting such a question to you? Where, then, is your danger? If you seek to become Catholics, *now*, and before this "invasion," ample opportunities were afforded. The whole college of cardinals, backed by all the monks from Italy, cannot, against your will, change your faith.

It is said you do not wish mummers and beadsmen stalking through England. Can they harm you? Remember that when you call the worshippers allied to Rome *mummers*, you at once remove that liberty you are so fond of saying is in England allowed; and remember, also, that you insult a large body of people who worship in a form which, for eighteen hundred years, has remained almost unchanged, and which your ancestors revered. I do not seek to make you love Rome. Hate it, if you will, but do her justice. Your laws were made by Catholics. Catholic barons gained your Magna Charta, and the Pope helped them. It was a Catholic nobleman that defeated the Spanish Armada, at a time, too, when glorious Queen Bess was burning her Catholic subjects!

My good countrymen, beware of the outcry, "No Popery." It is a cry got up by well-fattened bishops and rectors, who fear lest the nation's eyes may be opened to the enormous sums they receive from you. Look at your Church-rates; rates which you compel a Roman Catholic to pay, and yet will not allow him liberty to keep a bishop at his own cost. Are those rates applied as they ought to be? Is there a conscientious man amongst you that can say, Yes? Then, again, your clergymen. Are they the shepherds Christ speaks of? Oh, my friends, how very few of them labour in the vineyard! They enter church at half-past ten, they read prayers, they preach, they baptise and marry, and give you an evening service; and this they do one day in the week. Are they at the bedside of the poor? Oh, no; Protestantism is for the rich alone. Do they seek to reclaim the erring? Alas, I fear not; but they sit on the bench of justice (!), and send the poacher to prison for six months for endeavouring to feed his family! Are these the men on whom the Apostolical powers have fallen? Men of England, is this not true? And yet it is these men who are calling you in *Christian* charity, with harsh words and doubtful statements, to hunt down others who seek to worship God in the manner they believe our blessed Saviour ordained. False to their notions of faith, false in thought and deed, will you be led away by these men, reverend mountebanks and Scotch buffoons, by admirals whose fathers, as bishops and archbishops, took from the poor man's pocket his hard-earned gains, by Ministers whose family revel in the plunder they "gripped" from the Catholics? People of England, be yourselves, be just, be generous. Search for yourselves, and be not misguided by buyers and sellers of souls, purchasers of curacies, and dealers in future presentations.

These men upon platforms, where they lose that gentleness I would gladly prefix to their names—these men bid ye seek the Bible against Popery; the Catholics tell you to seek the Bible for Popery; you hear a great deal of nonsense about the Bible being suppressed by Papists, and only issued with notes. Learn this, my friends: a Protestant, one of the Establishment, takes his Bible, and, from reading it, adopts one view; a Wesleyan reads, and adopts another; a Baptist takes a third notion; a Kirkman a fourth. Who, then, is correct? If the Establishment says, "I am," it seeks that infallibility it denies the Pope; if all are correct, what becomes of our Saviour's words? Somebody, then, must be wrong. And the Catholic Church says to her subjects, "We will for you lay down the true meaning; you shall not err."

Fellow-countrymen, the Catholics may be wrong and the Wesleyans may be right, or the Moravians or the Scotch seceders; but while there is a doubt, the head of each body has a right to lay down rules and laws for the guidance of that body. Is not this common-sense? The Bible cannot teach men, without interpretation, the truth, when it says, "Thou shalt do no murder;" and yet says, "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, shall by man his blood be shed." Hear Mr. William Ewart and Sir Robert Inglis, in the House of Commons, on this point; and no longer, if you are just, arraign the Roman Church for interpreting the Scriptures for her followers. I ask you, as true sons of Britain, to be just. God bless the Queen! Catholics and anythingarians alike join in that cry; but we may not serve our Queen, and yet serve God as we will? I pity the Catholics of London at this moment, and I am disgusted with the bigotry of my countrymen. The Lord Chancellor should have spoken "ere the wine was in and the wit out." We have had a dancing Lord Chancellor—a drunken one is an anomaly!

But you are told it is against the law; then why the unchristian outcry? Let the majesty of the law vindicate itself; clap all the Bishops in the Tower, but do it gentlemanly; behead the Cardinal, but do not make brutes of yourselves; rake up the penal laws, dress every Catholic in a parti-coloured garb, but do not utter untruths against them. Dr. Brown has stopped one falsehood, by asking for the name of the man who "embezzled the 70l." Has that been given him? Lord Feilding stopped another by saying that Lady Penant left no sum for a church. As for a mother's desires, the Duke of York desired his debts might be paid when dying; desires may be for good or evil, and cannot be binding. I see in the *Times* a letter from a man who thanks his God he is a Protestant, pronouncing in harsh terms on a Catholic book he has got hold of. But what is that book? It is a book adapted for the examination of one's conscience, and points out certain sins which are hateful in the sight of God. If the Established Church looked as much after the sins of their people, the vice, the wretchedness of the poor victims of poverty would not be so great. What, afraid to put such a book in the hands of a pure woman! "Evil be to them that evil think." Such questions are not for those who are pure and virtuous, and this those pure and virtuous people know. The Protestant may thank his God he is a Protestant, and give his children licence to commit those sins.

Why, fellow countrymen, need I say more? Your own hearts will do justice to all parties; you will not prejudice and execute sentence upon those who have fought as you have fought, and borne as you have borne.

Lord John has nicely complimented a Catholic soldiery and the Queen's Master of the Horse by calling their faith "superstitious mummeries." The Premier, and the reverend buffoon his teacher, require to learn good breeding. Teach it them, my fellow-men. If the Catholics have outraged the law, let the law, the sober law, punish them; but give not to the falsehoods of platforms ear for one moment. They have visited your pockets; let them not take from you the love of truth, of charity, and of justice.

AN ENGLISHMAN.

CONTENTS.

THE "ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION."

FIRST SERIES—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the Two Letters to the "*Times*" by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the "New Batch of Bishops," from the "*Weekly Dispatch*;" Two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;" concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, November 2nd, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, November 7th, 1850.

THIRD SERIES—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P., the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the "Vatican Masquerade."

FOURTH SERIES—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the "Queen and the Pope."

SIXTH SERIES—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note from the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of "Catholics;" Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic Explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

SEVENTH SERIES—Leading Articles on Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto, from the Daily and Weekly Press; also Letters and Replies from the Bishops of the Established Church.

THE NINTH and TENTH SERIES will contain an important Collection of Documents and Letters from the Bishops and Clergy of the Established Church.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

MR. ROEBUCK'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL;
THE REV. MR. BENNETT'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL;
AND
LETTER FROM SIR BENJAMIN HALL, BART., M.P., TO THE
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

[The Editor has received such an immense quantity of original articles for appearance in the pages of the "Roman Catholic Question," that he finds it quite impossible to decide on the insertion of even a selection of them; indeed, his other occupations disqualify him from devoting sufficient leisure for the perusal of such very numerous manuscript articles; this fact he begs specially to plead in palliation of the appearance of many passages in the Fourth and Fifth Series which would otherwise have been erased.* His wish is to make these pamphlets a concentration of all such documents as appear in the Press and other channels, and are likely to have an influence in guiding the judgment of the public to a reasonable adjustment of the religious interests and principles now agitating the national mind, in giving insertion to documents from all sides of the question to make the entire Series possess a permanent interest for future reference. He would esteem it a favour if all parties would assist his judgment in these matters, by drawing his attention to any articles they may think calculated to make the pamphlets more in accordance with the necessities indicated by their general scope and object. The *Tenth Series* will contain several Letters from Dr. Cumming, G. Bowyer, Esq., and Cardinal Wiseman's Sermon at St. George's on the 8th of December.]

MR. ROEBUCK'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

MY LORD,—Were Parliament sitting, the present letter would not be written, as I should then be able in your lordship's presence to speak that which I now feel compelled to write. The extraordinary circumstances of the present time induce me not to wait until the meeting of Parliament, but at once to give expression to my opinions concerning the mischiefs which now threaten the peace of this empire; and I address myself to your lordship because I believe that great principles are in danger, and that to you is attributable the imminent risk to which they are exposed.

The great principles which are thus imperilled are those which your party and the great leaders of your party have for above half a century resolutely supported, and to which the chiefs of every party have, during the present century, rendered singular and honourable homage; which Mr. Pitt recognised and acted upon, when he resigned and broke up his Government in 1801; which Lord Grenville and the Whigs of his Cabinet obeyed when, in 1807, they left office rather than yield to the unconstitutional demand of the King, that they should pledge themselves never again, as a Ministry, to agitate the question of the Catholic claims; which governed the conduct of Lord Wellesley, Mr. Canning, Mr. Grant, Lord Grey, and a host beside, during the long and wearisome contest that followed upon the great question of justice to be done to the Roman Catholic subjects of the Crown; and which, at length, my lord, induced the chiefs of your party, in 1829, and yourself, as one of their followers, to forego all considerations of personal ambition and party aggrandisement, and give a hearty assistance to the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, when they, under compulsion, consummated, as we believed, the victory of common-sense and justice, and, as we hoped, for ever laid the foul demon of religious intolerance by passing the celebrated measure for the relief of our Catholic fellow-subjects from all civil disabilities. These, my lord, are the great principles which I believe now to be in danger, and which you, in my opinion, have put in peril.

But still you may ask—"What are these principles?" And you may say, "Though you approve the acts you mention, it by no means follows that you understand the motives which led to them, or the principles which governed the conduct you praise."

I will answer the question which I suppose thus put.

I believe, then, that the great men whose names I have cited, and whose deeds on the occasions referred to I have presumed to praise, thought that, in an empire like ours, and in which are united under one Government people professing every description of religious belief, and who by law are permitted to exercise the right of private judgment, and to support by argument, both in writing and in spoken discourse, the truth and wisdom of their own opinions, any attempt to degrade by law, and by the imposition of civil disabilities, any one class of believers, was not merely unjust, but in the highest degree impolitic also; and that while any deprivation of civil rights for such a cause was a gross injustice and cruel injury, the affixing on them badges of social inferiority, because of the peculiarity of their faith, would be an insult more galling still than injury; and therefore it was that they said, Make all men, whether Catholics or Dissenters, equal before the law; and let us, under the inspiration of a generous philosophy, and in accordance with the teaching of experience, be wise in time, and, forgetting those mournful days when the friends of freedom thought themselves compelled, for safety's sake, to be intolerant, erase from our laws those cruel and impolitic enactments which have made religion a curse instead of a blessing—a cause of hate and strife, and weakness, in place of being a bond of peace, of unity, and strength.

* Revised Editions of both these sheets have been published.

Ninth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.] [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row:
Of whom may be had "The Roman Catholic Question," Nos. I. to VIII.]

In accordance with this dictate of justice and policy was the conduct of the Whig party when they, with great honour to themselves, aided their opponents in passing the Emancipation Act in 1829. They then gloriously belied the oft-repeated imputation upon one who was once a great Whig, and they did *not*

“Give up to party what was meant for mankind.”

The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, I acknowledge, acted on this occasion upon considerations much narrower than those which were supposed to have moved the Whigs. He and his right hon. friend thought peace and the continuance of Roman Catholic disabilities impossible; and, simply because Ireland was turbulent, the Duke of Wellington was content to be just. He was just, however, only by accident. What he thought expedient happened to coincide with what justice demanded. Had his views of policy been different, had his iron will still resisted, he would have risked the chance of civil war, and scouted the Catholics and their claims.

But to you, my lord, I address myself as one of those who laid their superstructure of policy upon the broad foundations of a wise and generous morality. I may be wrong; but I will suppose you clearly to have understood the principles which you and your party enunciated. I will even believe that you really foresaw, and with a calm mind contemplated, the legitimate consequences of the act which you advised and supported. Remember, that your party drove the Duke of Wellington into concession—most unwillingly he yielded; still more unwilling was Sir Robert Peel. By your support the Catholics of Ireland were made to gather courage and organise a resistance which at length rendered civil war inevitable, if their claims had been any longer denied. During the long discussions which preceded the passing of the Emancipation Act, every possible consequence of the measure was described and threatened. In spite, nevertheless, of every suggestion of danger, the Whigs insisted upon concession, and cannot now assert that they were not told and could not foresee what has since occurred. Neither party rage, nor love of office, nor of praise, could so have blinded you as to make the events of the last few weeks a surprise. If, indeed, they were not foreseen, then must you confess yourself a short-sighted politician. If, however, you did believe that such things might happen, your present indignation must be feigned, and put on to serve a purpose, or your past confidence was falsely assumed and equally intended to deceive.

I will not quote “Hansard” against you. I leave to others a task which, though to me ungrateful, will be pleasant to themselves and most amusing to their hearers. And by this time doubtless many a Parliamentary orator could take a degree on account of his knowledge of your Lordship’s speeches. But, as I have no desire to convict you of mere inconsistency—and as I believe that even a most minute investigation of all that you have ever uttered in Parliament would not greatly conduce to my edification—I would rather address you as the Prime Minister of England than deal with your sayings as recorded in “Hansard.”

And now, my lord, I will tell you why I believe these great doctrines of civil and religious liberty to be at the present time in danger. I will endeavour to give a reason for the *fear* that is in me.

I find the public mind of England stirred from one end of the kingdom to the other. I hear fierce denunciations hurled against one large class of our Christian brethren, and I see politicians nearly of all classes bending beneath the storm, and joining in the cry against Papists and the Pope, and I most sincerely assert that I am utterly at a loss to understand how a really tolerant people could be thus carried away by an intolerant feeling. Does any danger really exist? Seeing what the public feeling is—knowing, as I have for many years known, the strong anti-Catholic prejudice of my countrymen—I am not surprised at this outbreak. Simple, downright intolerance is at the bottom of it. No real danger exists. It is not fear, but blind intolerant hate, that has aroused the land. The same sort of feeling as that which, in 1780, roused the mobs of London against Sir George Saville, and made that madman Lord George Gordon a hero, the idol and leader of the people, is now exercising a fatal influence upon the good sense of the English people. This feeling you have most unfortunately countenanced; you have given dignity and importance to an antipathy which you ought carefully to have allayed; and, by your ill-timed support, have done your utmost to keep alive for years a detestable intolerance, of which in your heart I believe you to be thoroughly ashamed.

Where, again I ask, and what, is the danger? I am not frightened by words, but I wish to know what is meant by “Papal aggression?” Can the Pope acquire power over any man in England merely by nick-naming a man Archbishop of Westminster, or by giving him a large hat and a pair of red stockings, and dubbing him a Cardinal? Has the Pope acquired any actual territorial right or influence by what is called parceling out the kingdom of England? We are all equal before the laws. He cannot invoke the power of the law, then, to persecute us into acquiescence in his doctrine. Upon what, then, is he to rely in order to gain influence over us? Persuasion. He and his emissaries must influence us through our reason; and we who pretend to rely upon the force of truth and the great safeguard of free discussion—we cover and tremble, and, like all cowards, bluster, because a foolish old man, at the instigation of a crowd of intriguing priests, and a set of weak-minded, silly converts from our own to the Catholic Church, has thought fit to give a certain number of bishops English names—and, spite of our pretended confidence in the truth of our own opinions, and our braggart boasting of the efficacy of reason and of argument, we are all at once horribly alarmed, and fancy that we shall awake some morning and find ourselves irretrievably Catholic. This very statement shows how thoroughly ridiculous is the whole affair when viewed in this light; but far different is it when we reflect upon the feeling which really has created all this confusion. When we remember that hate—religious bigotry—is at the bottom of it all; when we remember that every Protestant priest has, by religious antipathy, been roused into action; when we also bear in mind that every Catholic priest in England and Ireland has now been challenged to the combat, is it not clear, my lord, that your most unwise and unstatesmanlike letter has served as a trumpet to call into action the worst, and fiercest, and most dangerous passions that darken human reason, and harden the human heart? The work of years has in a moment been destroyed, and all the weary labour of eradicating those now vigorous weeds in our fair garden, religious hate and ecclesiastical intolerance, has again to be encountered. When you were a labourer at this work you had to aid you many Protestant sects then suffering under legal disabilities. These you helped to remove, and now that assistance will no longer be afforded to the friends of religious freedom, for every Protestant sect will band

together on the one hand, and range themselves in fierce hostility to all the Catholics on the other. And now, my lord, I put to you the question which you, as a statesman, ought long since to have asked yourself. *How is Catholic Ireland to be governed?* The immense majority of the people of Ireland are Catholic; will they not now be excited to the same frantic pitch in support of their religion as that which now agitates England against it, and upon the same principles upon which Protestants in England determine to keep down the Catholics? Will not Catholics in Ireland assert their own pre-eminence in that country, and insist upon equality, at least, in the baneful right of persecution? And here, possibly, I shall have the Pope brought forward, and I shall be insulted by being asked if I believe the people of Ireland bear allegiance to Queen Victoria? Let me answer this question by another. If, in fact, Catholics bear a divided allegiance—if by their religion, as we hear, they really give one-half of their obedience to the Pope—if this be a tenet of their faith, how, I ask, is their allegiance affected or diminished by the nominal distribution of England into Catholic sees? Let us, if we will, fulminate an Act of Parliament against the Catholics; does any one suppose that their faith will be in the slightest affected thereby? We cannot make people loyal by act of Parliament; we cannot, by excluding certain names, keep out the doctrines of the Catholic religion. But what we can do is to keep up religious disunion; we may make the empire a divided empire; we may band Protestant against Catholic, England against Ireland, and to you, my lord, posterity will refer as a man who, just when the real difficulties were conquered; when, by the united and continuous labours of our greatest statesmen, the law had become just, and peace and good-will were about to be established, took advantage of your great position to rouse up the spirit of strife and hate among us, to quicken into active life the demon of persecution, and to rend asunder a great empire, which, but for your fatal interference, would soon have become firmly united, peaceful, and prosperous. A melancholy distinction this, my lord, for one who all his life has styled himself the friend of religious as well as civil freedom! Your common sense must long since have been shocked at the wretched fanaticism you have evoked, and which, unfortunately, you will find a spirit beyond your power to lay.

I remain, my lord, your-obedient servant,

Milton, Dec. 2.

J. A. ROEBUCK.

THE REV. MR. BENNETT'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

(From the "Morning Chronicle" of Dec. 3rd, 1850.)

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, has just published a pamphlet, under the title of "A First Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on the present Persecution of a certain Portion of the English Church," from which we make the following extracts:—

"MY LORD,—I am desirous of informing your lordship, as one of my chief parishioners, and as one also charged by our Sovereign Lady the Queen to administer the government of this kingdom, and therein to keep order, peace, and harmony among her subjects—I am desirous of informing you, in both these capacities, that I am in great trouble and distress of mind at the present moment in regulating the affairs of my parish.

"I wish to inform you, my lord, that on Sunday the 10th of November, while I was performing the duties of divine service in the church of St. Barnabas, a tumultuous crowd assembled in the streets round about the church, and that a band of persons who had congregated together no doubt for this purpose within the very church walls, was guilty of a violent outrage against all decency, in uttering hisses, and exclaiming, 'No nunnery!' 'No Popery!' and other similar cries, alarming the devout worshippers who are in the habit of frequenting our church. I wish to inform you that in consequence of this outrage, being literally in fear lest some very grievous act of desecration might be committed, the churchwardens and myself thought it advisable to close the church for the evening service, and so it must continue to be closed, until these tumultuous assemblages are stopped, and that consequently our poor parishioners, and other respectable persons who are in the habit of attending divine service at St. Barnabas, are now hindered from so doing, and are in great degree deprived of their spiritual privileges.

"I wish to inform you that since that time it has been thought necessary by the Police Commissioners that our church and residence should be guarded night and day; and that we are at present under the vigilant inspection of police constables, who are watching the streets without cessation lest mischief should arise. I wish to inform you that on Sunday, November 17, a very large mob of most tumultuous and disorderly persons collected together a second time all round the church, and this with a much greater demonstration of violence than on the preceding Sunday; that a force of one hundred constables was required to keep the mob from overt acts of violence; that, notwithstanding the exertions of the police, much violence was committed, and a leader of the rioters taken into custody; that the mob again assembled at the evening service at three o'clock, and were guilty again of violent cries, yells, and other noises, battering at the doors of the church, and disturbing the whole congregation; that similar scenes occurred again on Sunday, the 24th of November, when I was interrupted in my sermon by outcries and other signs of disaffection as before; all this tumult, your lordship will please to remember, arising from persons collected from all parts of London—non-parishioners. I wish to inform you that the effect of this has been, that the poor, the timid, and particularly women and children, have assured me that they dare not any longer attend divine service; that they are so intimidated, as well in bodily fear, as also shocked by the blasphemous expressions of the multitude to which they are compelled to listen, that they think it advisable to remain at home until these disturbances are put down.

"I wish to inform you that, in consequence of this, we on our part—I mean the clergy—are very seriously crippled and hindered in the various pastoral works of our calling; that the minds of our parishioners are disturbed, and kept in an unhealthy stretch of excitement; that the peace and love with which it is our duty to look upon each other, however great our differences of opinion, are gone; that hatred, animosity, and bitterness of spirit, are engendered among us all; and that we are, in short, both clergy and people, in a very great state of trouble and distress; that we look forward to the next Sunday,

when the greater services of the Church will again be performed, under considerable fear that some violent outbreak may take place. In short, the whole idea of worshipping our God in the peace and love of Christians is almost destroyed. It is time, indeed, my lord, when a congregation of Christian worshippers is obliged to have detective police within the walls of their church to keep order, and a body of one hundred constables without, to keep off an unruly mob from bursting in and violating the Lord's sanctuary; when, in their attendance at divine service, the parishioners come in and go out in actual bodily fear; when the residence of a simple inoffensive clergyman is obliged to be guarded, all day and night, by special police constables, as though he were in a state of siege, defending himself against an enemy; it is time, my lord, then, that we ask ourselves the question—What is the meaning of all this? How has it come to pass? Where is the cause of it? Who has done it?

"I am about to tell you, my lord, who has done it. I am about, if you will have the patience to listen, to tell you where lies the moving cause of all this outrage and blasphemy. To those who have eyes to see, alas, it is too plain!

"In walking through my parish but a few days since I was met by a man offering to me for sale a slip of paper, purporting to be a letter from your lordship to the Bishop of Durham. And, shortly afterwards, I saw in a shop window the same letter advertised, with a great show of attraction, at price two shillings and sixpence per 100. Of course I could not but be attracted by seeing your lordship's name appended to a letter to the Bishop of Durham. Knowing the troubles which now beset our unhappy Church, its many schisms, wants, and infirmities, I might have been pardoned if I had imagined a letter to the Bishop of Durham suggesting some healing medicine for our wounds, pointing out some stay and comfort in our troubles, promising some synod or convocation for deliberation on our distracted state; I might have imagined a scheme for additional bishops—some enlargement of the national education of the poor—something, in fact, to help us on and guide us to deeper unity and more fervent love among ourselves.

"But, my lord, what was my surprise when I found that your letter was no more nor less than an attack upon the Bishop of Rome; that it was a manifesto full of anger and indignation against a power said to be feared now, though it had been for twenty-five years, or thereabouts, sedulously courted, cultivated, and nursed up into its present condition by no other than yourself. And what was my surprise, not unmixed with something deeper, to find that, although the Bishop of Rome was held up as a great source of danger to the mighty empire of Great Britain, at which I wondered, there was a still greater danger behind, at which I wondered more."

[Mr. Bennett here quotes that portion of Lord John Russell's letter in which his lordship sees from "clergymen of our own Church" a danger which "alarms him much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign."]]

"Having read this letter, which I did very carefully, my attention was fixed to the peculiar day of its date, November 4th, and I could not help remarking that it was a curious coincidence that this condemnation of the Bishop of Rome should tally so closely with the popular delights concerning Guy Fawkes. Then I looked on from November 5th to November 9th, the one almost as great a day as the other in the annals of the City of London; and when the day came, I anxiously read the speeches of the Lord Chancellor and Chief Justice, and of yourself; and it was curious to remark how only one topic seemed to engross all parties. It is reported that the Lord Chancellor said—

"There are some who have thought it right to depart from that simplicity of Christian worship which our divine Saviour adopted and left us an example of, and who have sought to approximate as near as possible to Romish forms, one would almost think, to invite that very invasion with which we have been recently visited."

"I was somewhat struck by this novel remark of the Lord Chancellor as to the 'simplicity of Christian worship which our Lord adopted.' I had always thought that our blessed Saviour worshipped in the Synagogue which was of the Jews—and in the Temple, under a most gorgeous, minute, and ceremonial ritual, concerning which his lordship might learn, if he had time to study in the books of the law of God; and I also thought that the disciples of our Lord were called 'Christians first at Antioch,' long after.

"Then followed your lordship's speech, also delivered at Guildhall.

"Now, all this, I confess, did somewhat startle me. I could not conceive how it was that the members of her Majesty's Government could find themselves of a sudden such deep masters of Divinity as thus to pronounce *ex cathedra* upon the deep mysteries of our most holy faith. It was a wonder to me how your lordship should have found time to add to the incessant toils of your political office the study of theology to such an extent as to pronounce on some of the most difficult dogmas of the Church. But, nevertheless, I said to myself. This letter is a very important thing, be it as it may: I compared the unhappy disturbances at our church of St. Barnabas with those speeches at Guildhall—I compared the mob, with its outcries of 'No Popery,' 'No mummeries,' and the like, with your lordship's letter, which breathes the same spirit, of 'no mummeries of superstition,' 'no superstitious ceremonies,' and the like. I said to myself—It cannot be very much a wonder that ignorant persons, consisting mostly of the lowest orders of society, should be so stirred up to molest us poor people of St. Barnabas, when the Prime Minister himself writes them a letter, and tells them that we are more dangerous than even the Pope of Rome.

"But your lordship will perhaps say, 'I never mentioned St. Barnabas. I only spoke generally of a certain party in the Church.' No, my lord, you did not mention St. Barnabas, but your residence is known to be in Chesham-place, you are known to have been a worshipper in St. Paul's Church, from which St. Barnabas is an off-shoot. You are known to be intimately acquainted, from your parochial connexion, with all that is done there, and the inference is so plain that any child could have made it, namely, that St. Paul's and St. Barnabas were the places which you really had in your mind, and the clergy of whom you spoke, among others, the clergy of those churches.

"Your letter to the people, coupled with the speeches at the Guildhall, speaks just to this effect—'Listen to me, people of England, and specially inhabitants of London. There is a great danger, as you all know, from the Bishop of Rome, who has just issued a bull, making a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and other bishops, of his communion. This is a great act of power and aggression against the Queen's supremacy; and it is my opinion that no one has a right to say anything concerning bishops and the episcopal superintendence of any of the people of this country, save only the Queen. It is plain that if you do not

look to it, you will have all the people converted to the Roman faith—you will have the Queen's crown in danger. Take care of your liberties. But, my good friends, I should like to tell you something further, and I beg you to listen to this most attentively:—However great a danger there is arising from the Pope, I will tell you of another which is even greater. There are a set of clergymen in the Church of England who are peculiar in their method of performing Divine service. They do and say such and such things (then you mention them); they teach this, and they teach that; they do this, and they do that;—and, let me tell you, that it is from these men that the danger of Popery comes. If it had not been for these clergy of the Church of England, you would never have had anything to trouble you in regard of the Church of Rome. Now take care of your Protestant liberties, raise a 'No Popery' cry, and protect the royal supremacy.

"What followed? Why, of course, the newspapers echoed your cry. Your lordship had given the major premiss—the newspapers supplied the minor—the mob drew the conclusion.

"Did you want them to draw the conclusion? However, so it was. A conclusion inevitable. Though I had been sorely puzzled to know why we were so attacked at St. Barnabas, now it was plain enough. For days and days, not a single newspaper but teemed with letters and articles about our poor inoffensive church; though I had been before sorely puzzled about it in my simplicity, now it all came upon me in a moment of enlightenment. How was it possible they should avoid it? How was it possible, when the un-cultivated, ignorant minds of the common people were so skilfully plied with incendiary matter by the Prime Minister of England, backed by the Lord Chancellor and an unscrupulous public press, that they should not take fire? When the law in Court of Chancery, and the law in Court of Queen's Bench, represented by grave and solemn men, spoke out from a Guildhall dinner, and egged on the multitude with speeches about 'civil and religious liberty,' and with many jestings about the Pope; and when Sir Peter Laurie wound up the story by saying, 'Whether Ministers led or followed, one thing was certain—Britons never would be slaves!—to what? 'either to Puseyism or to Popery!' how, my lord, could we wonder at what had taken place? Why, it would have been a perfect miracle had we escaped. You might as well have laid a train of gunpowder from Chesham-place, stretching along the streets to poor St. Barnabas' Church, and then put into the hands of your friends, 'the people,' a torch, and have said, 'Now you know where the mischief is;' and then have expected that the torch would not have been applied to the train.

"Will your lordship allow me to say a few words, first on the subject of your consistency in regard of this matter, and then in regard of your theological opinions.

"I remember a certain period in your lordship's political life—it was the year 1835—when, being appointed Minister of State for the Home Department, you became a candidate for the representation of South Devon; and notwithstanding your popularity as a Minister just accepting place, and other advantageous circumstances in that county, you were defeated by a majority of upwards of six hundred. You then addressed the electors in these words: 'To the effects of intimidation and undue influence; on the temporary alarm, on weak minds, caused by the revival of the cry of 'No Popery' my defeat is to be attributed.' So that Popery and your lordship were once identified. I remember well, even earlier than that, the many contests which used to take place in the House of Commons on the great subject of the 'Catholic claims,' and how you used to be an invariable champion on their behalf. So that 'Popery' has not always been a bane to you. I call to mind also the fact of your advocating, for many years, grants of the national money for the education of the Roman Catholic Clergy at Maynooth; so that neither the propagation of the faith of the Church of Rome could possibly then have been sinful in your eyes, nor, of course, could its existence in this country, at that time, have been thought by you dangerous to the Queen's supremacy.

"I have always considered that you have hitherto been a staunch, firm, and faithful advocate, and, in my opinion, a just advocate, of the rights of conscience. Both towards Dissenters, as well as Roman Catholics, you have invariably manifested a tolerant disposition; not considering that religion, or religious forms of Relief, should be any cause of the loss of the rights of citizenship. I bear in mind also the fact, that you advocate the rights of conscience to such an extent, that you have brought a Bill into the House of Commons for the purpose of allowing Jews to take part in the legislation of our country, and that you are notoriously of opinion, that not even the denial of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ought to form any bar to the free use of all the privileges and honours of our country. I call to mind also the fact, that you esteem the education of the poor of such great importance, that even creeds and dogmas of faith should be given up in order to combine every form of religious profession in a grand scheme of universal knowledge. Thus, in all points, I find you so far from being narrow-minded or bigoted to any one set of opinions, that you gladly ignore all the laws and obligations of every Church whatsoever. I find that you fly, whensoever it may suit you, to the teaching of those who are entirely opposed to the English Church, such as the Presbyterians, while nominally you remain within her pale; that you uphold the educational system of Dissenters who adopt no creed whatever, while you simultaneously worship in a Church which anathematizes heresy, and insists upon creeds as embodying truths vital to salvation. I find that your idea of the faith of the Gospel is large, broad, liberal, free; that you would not have yourself crippled or confined by any narrow circle of man's (as you call them) decrees or opinions; that you make an eclectic system of your own, and claim the right of worshipping in the morning in a communion which says, that without bishops there is no Church, while you worship in the evening in a communion which denies the episcopal grace altogether: in short, I find, by the whole course of your political life, that you are most liberal, generous, and unfettered, by any bonds of prejudice, to either creed, party, or Church. And finding this to be the case, I understand then very clearly what you mean by the clergy 'enslaving the soul,' and 'confirming the intellect,' which otherwise I could not have understood. 'Enslaving the soul,' points to the dogmatic teaching of any Church whatsoever. 'Confirming the intellect,' advocates the free and rationalistic use of God's great gift to men—the mind. 'Enslaving the soul,' would be tantamount to believing creeds such as the Athanasian. 'Confirming the intellect,' would be the necessity of belief in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or in the real presence in the blessed sacrament. In fact, my lord it is clear, in regard to your faith, judging it by your conduct, that you are in religion as in politics a Liberal. You are not a prejudiced man. You are not a bigot. You are not narrow-minded. Consequently I should suppose, *à priori*, that in regard to the State, or the Crown, or the Government administering the

Crown, you would be of opinion, that the imposition of any doctrine by such an evidently human institution as that, would be the very severest of tyranny; that the idea of a man's faith being bound down by a mere earthly king—the idea of a number of men's faith, that is, a Church—the idea of a great community of Christians being bound in things spiritual to obey the supremacy, or final adjudication, or decision of a Royal Court of mere men, that this idea would be dreadfully abhorrent to your feelings. A royal supremacy Church one would think the very last which a man of your liberal sentiments would tolerate—one which your faith would reject as impossible to be founded on God's word, and your principles deny as being unworthy the freedom of the human intellect. In short, I should say, *à priori*, that a State Church, State creeds, State Courts, State cathedrals, State deans and canons, and, above all, State bishops, would be a piece of king's craft odious in your eyes, as 'confining the intellect and enslaving the soul' most foully, most fatally.

"My lord, I agree with you entirely in the latter portion of what might have been expected of you *à priori*; I disagree with you in what I find existing in you as a fact; but again I agree with you in the moving principle by which you are guided and directed in your course. The moving principle is love of freedom, toleration, liberty; in that I agree. Your actions flowing out of that principle, namely, your letter to the Bishop of Durham and speech at Guildhall—in these I disagree, because they are inconsistent; and therefore that which I might have expected *à priori* does not exist. For while you cry out most heartily, 'Liberty of conscience,' you stop the mouths of men, confine the intellects of men, and enslave the souls of men, by a great, cumbersome, unwieldy, tyrannical machine called a State Church, which you enforce against us without mercy; and while you find fault with Christ's Holy Catholic Church for dogmatising in creeds, you nevertheless rule them with a rod of iron in the dogmas of an Act of Parliament. While you yourself get free of articles and Queen's supremacy in the liberty of a Presbyterian, you charge the unfortunate clergy of the English Church with their bounden duty of submission to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Queen's supreme headship and government over them in things spiritual. My lord, you are like a gawler who has manacled and fettered his prisoner, and, being free himself, stands off and laughs at him."

[Mr. Bennett then states his opinion that there is much of rottenness and corruption in the English Church, and that the source of that corruption is the royal supremacy, as now administered; and claims an Englishman's right to combine with others in measures for its reform, without their being considered as "insidious" in regard of their faith, or as enemies in regard of the Church.]

"But, my lord, either not understanding this, or else wilfully passing it by—I hope the former—you throw dust into people's eyes, and say that we, a certain portion of the English clergy, are bringing in the Pope, because we speak against the Queen's supremacy.

"It is not the Queen's supremacy that we complain of—it is the Prime Minister's supremacy that we complain of; not the thing, but the abuse. Your lordship is very earnest in your cry for 'liberty of conscience.' Why will you not concede it to us the clergy, as well as all other of her Majesty's subjects? You cry out against us, that we are enslaving the souls of the people; we cry out against you that you are enslaving the souls of the clergy—that you are crippling, deforming, poisoning the fountain of jurisdictions and the springs of the pure doctrines of the Catholic faith. If 'civil and religious liberty' means anything, we have a right to say this, and to act upon it; and that right we claim. It is your inconsistency that we would point out to the world, in fighting so bravely and enduring so much for a principle in yourself, and for yourself, which you will not concede to another.

"My lord, I quite agree with you that no man has a power to enslave the soul of another—that a man's conscience is free; but I charge you with inconsistency in not following this up, and allowing *a fortiori* that neither has a State such power.

"If one man has not the power, neither have many men. If I have no power to enslave your soul, neither have you to enslave mine; and I claim the liberty you enjoy for yourself. What the Dissenters have, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, the Roman Catholics, and I think justly, have, I claim for the English Church, and for myself. A man's conscience is a man's life; a man's soul is himself. We are under shackles, we have a right to get free if we can, as John Hampden did, whom you revere.

"I agree with your cry of civil and religious liberty. I believe that penal laws against religion are the greatest acts of tyranny of which a country can be guilty. I have read many of your lordship's speeches with the highest delight in the enthusiasm of my youth, when you fought hard and desperately against the (as I thought) bigoted and narrow-minded cries about Church and State, and about the danger of the Pope and his bulls. I have rejoiced exceedingly, as session after session went on, and Roman Catholics were at length admitted to their undoubted right to sit in Parliament as Christian men serving loyally a Christian Sovereign. I rejoiced to see penal statutes after penal statutes abrogated, as marks of antiquated prejudice, and a relic of a mere cowardly fear unworthy of a mind that believed truth greater than falsehood; for I said, if the truth is with us, what matters the Pope? If the truth is with the Pope, what matters our Acts of Parliament?

"And I agree with your lordship even more lately still, even up to last November 9th, when you said:—
"Persons of all religious persuasions, while obeying the dictates of their consciences as to the mode of worship they think it right to adopt, may rally round the institutions of the country, pay a graceful homage to the Crown for the protection they receive, and rejoice that they live in a land where freedom is generally, and I trust I may say permanently, established."

"But then I ask, how is it, my lord, that the poor clergy of the English Church may not be permitted, in the dictates of their conscience, to use the mode of worship which they think it right to adopt? Where is the religious freedom of sending down upon St. Barnabas a violent mob, to teach us how to worship our God, and not permit us to do as we like ourselves in a land where 'freedom is established'? Are the clergy of the Church of England the very persons who have not consciences? Your lordship says: 'Yes, but you are guilty of error; your practices are not in accordance with the Church of which you are members.' I reply, 'Who made your lordship judge of that?' You say: 'Why, I see the bishop has judged it so.' Then you quote the bishop, and shelter yourself under him. But, my lord, the bishop is not infallible. You object to the infallibility even of the Church. (See your own letter.) Much more you must object to the infallibility of a single bishop. How you would throw the bishop aside, with perfect contempt, if he were to say something in an episcopal charge about the schism of members of the Church of England taking their children to be baptised by a Dissenting minister, or about Church of England members frequenting

conventicles, which, according to the canons, is a censurable, if not a punishable act; how you would rise up in indignation against such an infringement of the rights of conscience then! But where is your consistency? You quote the bishop and the Church on your side when you want to make use of an argument against an adversary; you throw them altogether out when they make against yourself. Is that fair, my lord? No; you know it is not. But it suits your purpose just now to crush a certain party in the Church, and to warn off the indignation of the people, which is burning against Popery, by appearing to take their side just for the moment. You are not on their side really. You do not really mean that you think the Pope dangerous. You do not really think that the Queen's supremacy in temporal things—otherwise her crown—is in danger in consequence of a Papal bull. You do not really mean that a number of Roman bishops, exercising spiritual jurisdiction over their people, is an aggression against the Queen's right to her throne; for if you did, you would not surely act as you have done all your life, in endeavouring to promote this very point. You would not have repealed statute after statute to prepare the way for it. You would not have given large grants of money to the College of Maynooth. You would not have acknowledged Roman archbishops and bishops in the Colonies, and have paid them salaries, and have given them precedence over English bishops, and have recognised their titles. You would not have counselled and aided in various Acts of Parliament in which these titles and salaries are made the law of the land. You would not have conceded in the Court of Dublin a priority of rank, or, at least, a recognition of rank, in the Irish bishops; and have, on many occasions, addressed them by their titles. No, my lord, I cannot impute to you the idea of having done all this, or joined in all this, freely and notoriously, with a conjunction of your opinion being in reality what it seems, that Popery is like to be the destruction of the Queen's authority in this realm of England. Why, I would ask you, are you now denying both the words and the works of your whole life? Why put before the people these exciting things, to which your life gives the great answer, they are not true? Why, my lord, fondle, and pet, and nurse a viper which you knew would only sting you when it got sufficient warmth and vitality? If the Roman Catholics are dangerous, why did you foster them? If they are not dangerous, why do you say they are?

“My lord, you not only excite ‘the weak minds’ of the people of England against Cardinal Wiseman and the Pope, and cry ‘No Popery,’ but you do something more. While you say ‘Popery is dangerous, down with it,’ you say, ‘It is not my fault, gentlemen. It is true I have always advocated their claims, and forwarded their views, but now that they have come out into power, that is not my fault, it is the fault of certain clergy within our Church.’ You couple yourself with us, although now a follower of Dr. Cumming, a Presbyterian. It suits you for your purpose to do so, and you do it. Knowing where the blame ought to lie, you turn it off, and say, ‘There, look at that—look at these clergy—look at their ‘mummeries,’ and their ‘superstitions’—observe their Roman doctrines, and their insidious teaching. These are the men that have caused this danger.’ Thus, under a masked battery, having diverted the attention from yourself, you aim your guns with too true an aim against us. ‘Down with those clergy of ‘mutterings,’ and of ‘confessions,’ and of ‘infallibility,’ and of ‘freedom from the Queen’s supremacy.’ These are the mischief-makers.’ Then the mob is stirred and infuriated, and, instead of the Roman Catholics themselves, we become the butts and objects of hatred, and ridicule, and violence. If there is a precipice at the end of a certain walk, and you know it, and dread it, and would not for the world move towards it, for fear of falling over it, you would not hate the precipice; you would know of its existence, and simply avoid it. But if, after a while, some one began to lead you towards it step by step, and you went under his guidance, as it were fascinated and bewildered, when you should at length arrive at the precipice, and fall over, and thereby injure yourself—with what kind of feeling would you look at such a guide?—hatred, wrath, repugnance, punishment. But this, my lord, you have just done towards us, the clergy of St. Barnabas. You have told the whole Protestant world, concerning the Roman Church, that it is the great enemy of the Crown of Queen Victoria. You have saturated the people with the unchristian feeling of looking upon Rome with a sort of hatred, as though it were a natural enemy to England. Having signified this, you go to the Bishop, and you say—‘See what the very Bishop says. He speaks of these clergy as men ‘leading you step by step to this precipice.’ What is to be done with them?’

[The reply to this interrogatory is, that the very Bishop whom Lord John Russell now quotes consecrated, only five months since, the church of St. Barnabas itself, approving all he saw and all he joined in. Mr. Bennett then proceeds to inquire whether the Bishop could now mean to censure those very same things.]

“I may fairly say the whole spirit and tone, the intention, the mind of the whole church and college; the foundation for the choristers, the masters, the mistresses, the curates, the general scheme and arrangement of the whole; and yet still, moreover, as far as I myself am humbly concerned, my doctrine and my way of teaching; my views and principles in the regulation of the service; my character as a priest; intending to do, teach, and pursue my way, in the very way I am now pursuing it—I repeat, all this was known to the Bishop. I know full well his kindness on that occasion. I believe fully that he sacrificed much on that occasion of his own private feelings and opinions as an individual; and I am filled (and all who know me will bear me witness how I have always expressed myself to this effect) with the greatest gratitude for the kindness of manner and the paternal affection with which the Bishop then treated me. And therefore it is that I cannot imagine that he should speak so harshly now. I believe, then, there is a delusion. The Bishop knows that I never can go back in the things I have said and done; that I can never, from any fear of man, change, or recede from that which has been begun as a principle. I have told him that I cannot. That which he saw and knew then—that which he saw and blessed then—that which he knew to be my intention and mind then, in ceremonies and ritual—that it shall be now, please God, and for ever the same, unchanged, unchangeable.

“Therefore, my lord, I fear you have done unjustly by St. Barnabas. I fear you have traduced our clergy here by imputing false things to them. It cannot possibly be that we are leading the people step by step over the precipice. How can we, when the bishop led the way himself, in consecrating and blessing the church which you now see?

“There is something further which I have need to say about your lordship’s consistency. Not your consistency in the political measures of your Government, for of course with that subject, as a clergyman, I have nothing to do; nor your consistency in your own personal conduct and rule of faith, for of course the right of private judgment being in your own mind established as a necessary part of Protestantism, you

only follow its dictates in following your own will in regard to religious worship. But conceding, as I do, the right of private judgment to you, I would ask, why will you not concede it to others?—why will you not concede it to me? It would seem but fair that a latitudinarian should give latitude to others; a free thinker, free thought; a free agent, free action; a liberal, liberality. But, as I have shown, it is not so with you. What you impose on others, you do not impose on yourself; what you demand of others to be given to you, you are very reluctant indeed to give to them. But this principle, vicious and faulty as it is, is allowable, you might say—a general, a political, an abstract fault, and nothing to do with yourself. You perhaps try, as many politicians have done, to separate your political character from your personal, and you might say, it is very true I am an advocate for the right of private judgment, and civil and religious liberty, and so I would in my personal conduct abstain carefully from any measure or dealing with my neighbour which would violate that principle; but as a statesman and a public servant of the Constitution of my country, I am bound to adhere to that Constitution; and finding, as I do, that the Church compels certain things of those who are her members, it is my duty to enforce her laws.

“The truth of the matter is, that statesmen such as your lordship, when they separate themselves into a public and a private character, immediately set up for themselves two opposite rules of conduct; and those opposite rules of conduct are the destruction of their consistency. The rule of conduct in private perhaps may be ‘the Word of God,’ or ‘faith,’ or ‘religion;’ the rule of conduct in public is ‘public opinion.’ While therefore, in private, statesmen may possibly retain a tolerably consistent and harmonising course, it is impossible that they can do so in public; because their rule is a shifting rule. As it is all-powerful, and subdues everything that comes in its way, so it is never the same two years together—always varying, uncertain, contradicting itself, and therefore they who are under it are always varying, and not certain, and contradicting themselves. And yet it is impossible to hold the reins of Government and not bow down to it. So, at least, it appears. ‘What is the prevailing dominant temper of the national mind? Call it public opinion, or the spirit of the day, or the popular judgment, or the temper of the times, or the idea of the age, or the voice of the people, or fashion, or the ruling principle around us; in each alike we acknowledge the presence of a mysterious influence, shaping our thoughts and acts, controlling, overawing, resisting—now laughing to scorn, now crushing with violence, now whispering and tempting us to silence, and now clamouring with all the noise of the people; but before which, as private individuals, we quail, and as citizens we own and even boast, that the governments of the earth must bow and obey.’ Yes, my lord, as a governor of this kingdom it is impossible for you to resist public opinion. You must either obey it, or you must cease to be the Minister of our country. You prefer the former. Hence, though an advocate for Popery in your earlier life, you are its enemy now. ‘Catholic Emancipation’ was your cry formerly; now, ‘No Popish Bishops,’ not seeing that the one is the natural and just development of the other. At the South Devon election, you were rejected as Secretary of the Home Department, because of your adherence to the side of ‘Popery.’ You have taken a lesson from that mischance, and are determined to maintain your place as Prime Minister on the opposite side of ‘No Popery.’ Public opinion compels you. It binds you down to its chariot wheels, and hurries you hither and thither just as it will. You play into each other’s hands, and, as it were, feed and sustain each other. Public opinion induces you to write to the Bishop of Durham, and then your letter is seized upon by public opinion as the vehicle for propagating itself. You are used as a kind of standard or sign of the people’s will.

“But whatever this may be in other men—however in some cases it may be imagined that a politician can have two consciences, one for his country and one for himself, I now desire to show, in your lordship’s case, that there is no such difficulty. You have been consistent in being inconsistent in all ways; you have not as a statesman been now deriding and destroying what before you praised and fondled, and that alone, but, as far as regards the matter now in hand (for you must remember that I write this letter as a parish priest to his parishioner) you have done the very same in your parochial connexion with our poor church of St. Barnabas. I wish, my lord, to remind you of this, and to expostulate as gently as I may with the fact of a sudden and unaccountable aversion where before there was at least some degree of toleration and countenance.

“In the year 1843, the Church of St. Paul, Knightsbridge, was consecrated by the Bishop of London. You being a parishioner, became from the very first a member of the congregation therein worshipping; you were constantly at divine service, constantly at sermons; you have received the Holy Sacrament, you and yours, at my hands. You must, therefore, have been aware of my teaching in the pulpit, must have been aware of the system or party in the Church to which we were attached (for, my lord, it is of no use to disguise the fact that there are parties in the Church). You must have been aware of all this, and yet there you remained for the period of nearly seven years.

“Moreover, being one of our chief parishioners, you generously contributed subscriptions to our parish schools, and all other charitable institutions devised for the use of the poor. In private, also, according as the need arose, you have more than once, unsolicited and of a kind sympathy with the needs of our poor, sent me private sums of money for their benefit: you have frequently accompanied these gifts with remarks of your own concerning the way in which you would desire them to be used, all showing such a spirit of charity and fellowship with us, as induced us to think that neither our public teaching nor our private pastoral works could be altogether unacceptable to you.

“In course of time, among other pastoral duties, we devised the scheme of building a new church. When the idea was first set forth that this very church from which I am now writing, and which unhappily has drawn down on our heads such hatred and bitterness of spirit—this very church, against which, among others, if not principally, your lordship’s language, in your letter to the Bishop of Durham, is levelled—when this project for the good of our poor brethren was set forth, you most generously were among the first to contribute of your alms for its advancement. And not only this, my lord. It was not the chance or careless gift of one who thought not of what he was doing; it was not money thrown down and left, as it might chance, to be fruitful or not; but you were so good as to enter into the details of the plan. It was at Christmas, 1846, being then at Woburn, that you wrote to me concerning this matter. You had been at Church the Sunday preceding, and there had been an offertory, being Ember week, for the Curates’ Fund. In your letter you inclosed an alms gift for that purpose, and then entered into details concerning the new church. You were so good as to propose a specific plan of your own, which had, indeed, some

advantages in it, but, we thought, not on the whole advisable. Though I could not agree with you in the idea which you suggested, still I was very thankful for your expression of sympathy, and specially as it manifested the fact that the good work intended to be done had been a matter of consideration with you. In that letter you go on to speak of the new church in these words:—

“Will you permit me to say, that if I understand you rightly, the seats of St. Barnabas are to be all free seats; I think you are mistaken in not requiring some small payment (say sixpence a month) for at least half of them. I believe they would be more valued, and the money might be spent in keeping the seats clean, and warming the church.”

“My lord, you can hardly imagine how gratified I was at the reception of that letter—I was so pleased to think that you could, in the midst of your laborious occupations, have been able to give our little Church of St. Barnabas even a thought; and I wrote, in reply, that our idea was to make the church entirely free and open, on the ancient principle of churches, leaving the payments necessary for the maintenance of the fabric to the voluntary offerings of the people, which would be made at the offertory. But this by the way. My object in reminding you of this letter, is to identify you with myself, and St. Paul's, and St. Barnabas, in knowledge, if not in spirit; to show that at that time you fully entered into the system of the church which I advocated; that you did not object to my teaching; that you had no fault to find with my general principles and views. Could I at that time have been among those ‘insidious’ persons whom you now would have the people to destroy, and get rid of? And yet there has been no change whatsoever. It is all the same. The same ecclesiastical system; the same line of preaching; the same ‘mode of worship,’ the same ritual, and ceremonial observances. I would ask, then, is it consistent of your lordship, is it kind, now to persecute that which before you took part in? Have I done anything (as far as my poor flock of St. Barnabas is concerned) to merit such an utter change of feeling and of sentiment, as now appears in your letter and speech? Last spring you joined in our worship at St. Paul's. This autumn, not so much as six months after, you say of certain of the clergy, among whom your description will of necessity include myself—you say of them, that you have little hope that they will ‘desist from their insidious course;’ that course containing, in your estimation, ‘a greater danger than the aggression of a foreign sovereign.’ Is this quite fair?”

“But, my lord, let me go on a little further. So late as the year 1849, at our anniversary festival of St. Barnabas, you were so kind as to say that you would come and take part, personally, in our festivities. You were to do this as a parishioner, together with your colleague, the Earl of Carlisle. When the day came, the unexpected summoning of a Cabinet Council prevented you (you wrote to me to say so); and at the dinner, that day, the Earl of Carlisle spoke as follows.”

[Mr. Bennett here quotes a passage from the address of Lord Carlisle, which has already been quoted in the *Morning Chronicle* of the 15th Nov.]

“So far, then, as St. Barnabas day, 1849, there was no diminution of agreement and countenance, to a certain extent, of the tone and principles of worship in St. Paul's Church. I say, to a certain extent, because no doubt, with all the external and apparent agreement, it would be very possible that points of internal disagreement lurked beneath. It would be very possible that all you had done and said were merely the demonstrations of a kind heart, wishing, although you did not agree, not to manifest anything on your part of open hostility. It might have been a desire not to kindle strife, not to sow the seeds of disunion in a congregation—to show the example of a parishioner, duly attending his parish church: or it might have been (which I hope sincerely it was not) that you were like Gallio, and cared for none of these things, desiring to let them take their course. But this, for the reasons just given, I do not think could have been the case. At any rate, be it either the one or the other of these causes, there could not have been anything so very severely wrong in me as to justify the expression contained in your letter, in 1850, when, in 1849, you were willing to take open part in the charitable works of my parish, with me and for me. If my course was insidious, why did you take part in that course? If I so muttered the liturgy as to disguise its language, why did you join in so glaring a profaneness for nearly seven years? If I practised ‘mummeries and superstition,’ why did you come to join in them for nearly seven years? Why did you so far and so deeply join in them as to receive at my hands, so late as Ash Wednesday, 1849, the Holy Eucharist, yourself and your family? If I were one of those designated in your letter as bringing a greater danger than even the Pope, why then, my lord, was it that you said not all this before? Why, for seven years—not occasionally, remember, or as a stranger, but in your place as a regular parishioner—why, by external acts of union and participation in what was being done—why, by this participation manifested in the deepest mystery of our faith, did you signify to the world (as far as such things can be signified) your agreement essentially in all that was done? If you really thought that your soul, and the souls of your family, were likely to be enslaved, and their intellects confined, why place yourself and yours within a sphere of religious teaching which was tending towards that end? Or if you feared not for yourself, as being too strong to heed it, why countenance it by your own example in regard of others who were weak? why tend towards, and co-operate with, a system which was likely to be so pernicious and so fatal to their spiritual welfare? And lastly, my lord, why in the midst of all this (if it were so) ‘insidious teaching,’ ‘mummeries of superstition,’ and ‘leading of the flock to the verge of the precipice’—why did you lend your countenance and give your assent, not only to the maintenance and support of that system as then established at one church, but also to the building and establishment of another, which you knew would be conducted on the very same principles? Why, not only look on, and bear with, and take part in, such a profane and wicked perversion of truth as I must really have been guilty of, if your words are true, with a passive or acquiescent permission, but join publicly and actively in its propagation and extension? Either, my lord, you and myself must have been wilfully, and grossly, and wickedly wrong for seven years, or we were right, and only mistaken or misunderstood. If the former, how awful must be our case before the living God, at the great day of judgment—tampering with holy things, receiving of his blessed Sacraments, joining in His holy ordinances, presuming to stand before Him, and invoke His holy name in prayer—and all the while imagining that we were doing no more than a ‘mummery,’ and believing no more than a ‘superstition!’ If the latter, why have you given up what you once approved, or at least assented to? why have you abandoned what you were content to practise? why have you denounced what you helped to advance and to increase?”

[Mr. Bennett next proceeds to the second section of his letter, the subject of Lord John Russell's theology.]

The first religious topic he treats of, following the order of his lordship's own letter, is "the honour paid to saints." This practice, as followed by the Church of England, Mr. Bennett defends as a commemoration in no way remarkable, instancing her dedication of churches to saints, the special services set apart in honour of them in the Prayer Book, and the example of antiquity as proofs of its propriety; and he expresses his desire that Lord John Russell would, "as a member of his parish, escape from the teaching of Dr. Cumming in regard to this point of honour paid to saints, because he believes that the Presbyterians deny all idea of that great doctrine, which the Catholic Church has always faithfully clung to, namely, the communion of saints." He proceeds:—]

"Your next topic, my Lord, is 'The infallibility of the Church.' Here again I plead guilty to your charge. I do claim for the Church infallibility. I have always taught this, and I now desire to tell you why I have taught it. I think that infallibility is essentially necessary for the very existence of a Church; that any article of faith, vital to salvation, depends necessarily upon it; that without it we have nothing certain to believe at all. But in what sense, and how? I do not believe there is infallibility in the English Church, or in any particular national Church: our Articles of Religion expressly say that there is no such infallibility; that all national Churches are liable to err. But national Churches are not the Catholic Church. It is the whole, universal, Catholic Church, throughout all ages, and in all countries, and in all times agreeing, and blessed by the Spirit of God, as the Apostles were at Pentecost—it is this Church, the Church of the living God, of Christ Jesus our Lord, that is expressly called in Holy Scripture, 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' Your faith rests upon Holy Scripture; Holy Scripture must be true. You can only know that it is true upon the infallibility of the Church, which has pronounced it to be so, and handed it down to you. In proportion as you take away the infallibility of the Church, you take away the certainty of the Holy Scriptures; and in proportion as you take away the Holy Scriptures, you destroy your own faith in Jesus Christ, by which you hope to be saved. Without this idea, I see no resting-place anywhere for any doctrine or for any practice: no certainty for anything that we read, see, or imagine in the whole wide ground-work of our salvation. We become at once rationalists; and from rationalists, sceptics; and from sceptics, infidels.

"Next to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, you mention 'the sign of the cross,' and you call it superstitious. I do not suppose you mean to make any distinction between a superstitious sign of the cross, and a sign not superstitious; because if you only mean that, of course we grant your charge at once. Anything superstitious, as such, is of course objectionable. Superstitious prayers, superstitious reception of the sacrament, superstitious reading of the Bible, as far as it is superstitious is of course wrong; but take away the superstition, and then the thing itself is right. This you would readily grant. But what you mean, no doubt, is this—that all use of the sign of the cross is superstitious. If so, then you go against the Church, which commands it at the font in baptism. I myself will freely confess to you, that I highly delight in that holy sign."

[Mr. Bennett then refers to Bishop Grindall's Articles of Visitation, L'Estrange's 'Alliance of Divine Offices,' and the canons of the Church in defence of the use of the sign of the cross. He then proceeds:—]

"I can conceive a Socinian, or a Deist, or a Unitarian, or some violent heretic of that kind, to object both to the name of the Holy Trinity and the Cross of Jesus, both its doctrine and its sign; but how an orthodox Christian can object (always setting aside prejudice) I am quite at a loss to understand.

"The next topic is 'The muttering of the liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written.'

"I hardly know how to reply to this, for it would seem an accidental defect either in the voice of the ministering clergyman or the ear of your lordship. He might not perhaps articulate clearly, or you hear clearly. But if you mean more than the accident—if you mean that we 'mutter' with a purpose, and that purpose is 'to disguise the language,' then I must ask your lordship what this means. To disguise, is 'to conceal by an unusual dress'—'to hide by a counterfeit appearance'—see Dr. Johnson. What is it, then, that we hide or conceal? The English language? And with what dress or counterfeit do we so hide it? It probably could be said, by the Latin language, that being the language of the Roman Communion—our point of danger. Now, if this really be the idea of our 'muttering,' it would indeed be 'mummery,' or 'playing under a mask,' or 'acting,' or any other of the accusations brought against us. But it cannot surely mean so great an absurdity as this; if not, then there can only be one other meaning possible, the concealing or hiding the language altogether under sound, mere sound, musical or otherwise. It is, then, said (for remember, to disguise, conveys an act with a purpose) that we use the choral or musical, or cathedral form or service in order to hide or conceal what we say by music. But suppose you say, 'I did not mean a purpose but only an accidental hiding or concealing.' Then we are thrown back on the more ordinary arguments for the cathedral and choral form of divine service. And then it becomes a matter of private taste, private like or dislike, a matter of suitableness one way or another, and not a matter of principle. If so, all about our being 'insidious,' a 'mummery,' or 'acting,' falls to the ground."

[After quoting the authority of St. Chrysostom and the "Life of Dr. Arnold" on this subject, Mr. Bennett goes on:—]

"I think I need hardly argue the matter of the choral service now. There are so many works on the subject easily within your lordship's reach. You ought to read them before you judge those who simply follow the Church's authority. You ought, indeed, to be more careful of bringing accusations before you are sure of your ground.

"But I must come to the next topic of your accusation, which is somewhat more important—it regards Auricular Confession, Penance, and Absolution. They all go somewhat more or less together, and they form, I do acknowledge, a very material feature in the organisation and discipline of the Church.

"In explanation of this, and in deprecation of a premature judgment of things you could hardly well be supposed to understand, I would ask your lordship simply to turn to your Prayer-book, at the service for Ash Wednesday. I remember that in one of our more happy years, and when I was not considered among the 'insidious,' that you were at church at St. Paul's on an Ash Wednesday. It was Ash Wednesday, 1849.

"My lord, I was always anxious, most anxious, as a pastor of Christ, set over you in the Lord's congregation of which you were a member—I was always most anxious, secretly within myself, for your spiritual welfare and salvation. This cannot, I hope, be charged against me as any attempt at self-glorification, or claiming more in my duties than was required of me. Our duty is so very imperative, to 'watch for the

souls' of the flock committed to our keeping. I state the mere fact, that when I could not help seeing you as I did continually before me, subject to my teaching, hearing the elucidation of Gospel truths, and the Church's authority from my mouth, and joining in prayer and sacraments from time to time—I state the mere fact—that a peculiar and awful sense of responsibility was felt to be kindled within. It seemed as if great things might have been depending on the rightness of my teaching, and that the Church, in her real beauty and magnificence, and truth, might be lost or not lost, by some mistake or want of judgment on my part. I knew your temptations and dangers. I felt for you in the awful responsibilities of your high office, as the chief ruler of our country. I feared for you, and I prayed for you. I would never have told this, as now I do, but for the special and awful crisis which has, through your principal instrumentality, been brought about. But this now I will tell, known before only to God, that frequently, very frequently, in the lone night, and when you have been labouring in the House of Commons, I have been in the church where you worshipped, and by name (of course with others of my flock according to their needs), have invoked the Almighty God of nations, that He would vouchsafe to guide your policy for our country's welfare, and our Church's blessing. Yes, often have I prayed specially on your behalf; often have I specially sought of God, that I might have grace in preaching, to win you to the deeper truths of our most holy faith. I say this now, because at such a time it was—I mean in the year 1549, so late as Ash Wednesday, 1549—I find a note in my journal, thus:—“Lord and Lady John Russell at the Holy Communion this day. This looks well. Oh, that we could make them love the Church!” I give you, my lord, the very genuine simple words of my private journal, such words, of course, never expecting to see the light. But there they are, and I give them to you to show you how I felt them, and how rejoiced I was, on such a day, at such a time, to see the testimony of your faith, your repentance, and your love.

“But what has all this to do, you will say, with auricular confession and penance? Why this much, that on that day you did hear and join in that solemn service of the Church which is called ‘the Communion Service?’ and in that service you heard these words: ‘Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord, and that others, admonished by their example, might be more afraid to offend. Until whercof (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished), it is thought good,’ &c. The idea of penance is, then, held in the Church of England as a thing desirable.

“With regard to auricular confession, and absolution by the priest, you will see the doctrine of the Reformed Church clearly set forth in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI.

“To cite to you all that is said by divines of the Church of England on this head would be absurd in such a letter as this; and to refer you to the fathers of the early Church to explain its doctrine and practice would be even more absurd. Sufficient it is for me to call your attention to the fact that confession to the priest (commonly called auricular confession) is advocated and pronounced useful by the English Church; the only difference, you will observe, between the Church of Rome and ourselves being this, that Rome makes such confession absolutely necessary for salvation; the other leaves it as a voluntary act, to be used, or not used, according to the spiritual needs of the penitent. If your lordship could but follow the simple teaching of Edward VI.'s first Prayer-book, to the effect that auricular confession was to be left to each man's own conscience—he that used it not to be judged of him that did not use it, he that did not use it not to be judged of him that did use it—then we should, indeed, have very little difficulty with each other. If you find fault with those clergy who do, for the comfort of penitent souls, receive their confessions when tendered; if you find fault with them for going to the priest in difficulties, and when they cannot find their own way out of conscientious scruples, and misgivings of sin; if you find fault with priestly absolution, and the announcement made to sinners that they may repent, and be saved; then you find fault, not with the clergy, but with the Prayer-book; not with me, my lord, but the Church. Your better rule had been, since these holy things always suffer by the conversation of the world, not to have thrust forward this subject so rudely. The rule of the English Church is clear.

“I would remark to you, further, that the custom of auricular confession derived from this, both in doctrine and in practice, is clearly deducible all through the Reformation, down to our own days.”

[Mr. Bennett here quotes the authority of Archbishop Cranmer, Erasmus, Bishop Ridley, together with the visitation articles of Bishops Overall, Andrewes, Montague, and others, in support of auricular confession.]

“I have incurred, I am aware, much odium, I have lost, I know, the affections and confidence of many, by openly stating the Church's doctrine and rule in this matter. It is very unpopular to the Protestant ear. There is hardly anything so identified with Rome. Nevertheless, what is truth must be said; and this consolation always attaches to it, namely, that one penitent, in his repentance and confession, saved from sin, is more to be valued in the sight of the holy angels and saints of heaven and God himself, than ninety-nine who need, or think that they need, no repentance.

“I have endeavoured now, my lord, to explain to you, in some degree, those points of your objection to the Church which reflect upon her discipline and doctrine; but there is one point, which stands the first and foremost on your list, which I have as yet left untouched. I have reserved it to the last, because I know that in your own opinion it is the most important. I am not much afraid that you care about the infallibility of the Church, or her power of the keys, or the muttering of the liturgy; I should rather be afraid that these are put forth, because you believed that they would prove popular objections for the mob. I really believe that the one, and the only one, real objection and alarm in your lordship's mind is this, the Queen's supremacy. I think, from what I have observed in the course of Dr. Hampden's appointment to the see of Hereford, and Mr. Gorham's appointment to the living of Bramford Speke, that your opinion concerning the royal prerogative in the matters of the Church is very high indeed; that you arrogate for the Crown something which approaches the actual Papal powers, against which, in the Pope himself, you so vigorously protest. And then we must remember that the royal prerogative now is nothing more than the Prime Minister's prerogative; and the Prime Minister's prerogative is the people's prerogative. Hence the strength of the cry which now rises up against any party in the Church which either denies or limits it. It is easy to see why statesmen delight to honour the Queen's supremacy. It is easy to see why Parliaments, why meetings, why parish vestries, why all assemblies of men, of whatever creed, or whatever kind, or for whatever purpose banded together, decry what is now called ‘The Papal Aggression.’

“Men have not yet learned to separate the spiritual power of the Church from the temporal. They imagine that when the Pope is mentioned as a foreign prince or potentate, and that when he claims jurisdiction in England, that he claims jurisdiction over all England. Every one who knows history, knows full well that the Rock upon which the Church is founded is not of this world—‘My kingdom,’ said our blessed Lord, ‘is not of this world’; that the throne of St. Peter the fisherman does not claim jurisdiction over the souls of men, because it accidentally happens to be also a temporal throne, but only because of the spiritual power committed by our Lord:—‘Upon this Rock I will build my Church.’

“It suits your lordship, because it is a popular outcry, to set the people on a false scent about ‘No Popery,’ in order to strengthen your own secret schemes within, of strengthening the royal power in the things of the Church. All the bishoprics, deaneries, canonries, a great number of livings and offices and places in and about the Church, are yours. You are contending, therefore, for the continuance of your own advantage, when you contend for the continuance (in your sense of it) of the Queen’s supremacy. You are contending for the power of general liberty of opinion—latitudinarianism, freethinking, scepticism, and the like. When you contend for a royal headship over the Church, you are contending for your own power to appoint a Dr. Hampden to all the sees of England, and a Mr. Gorham to all the parishes of England, that by so doing you may, by the weakness of the clergy, and their division, and their jealousies of each other, ride through the storm yourself triumphant. I leave it for your consideration, whether you really have any love for the truth, and any desire to increase the strength of Christ’s Church, as such, when you speak of the royal supremacy, or whether it is only from a sort of statesman’s etiquette that power should always be in his hands.

“Suffer me to remind you, my lord, that in the English Church, as by law established, there are two distinct component parts. There is not only a royal power, as over civil matters, attaching to the Church by accident, but there is the sacerdotal power inherent in the Church by essence. That is accidental without the existence of which the Church would still exist—namely, the royal supremacy; that is essential without the existence of which the Church would be no Church at all, namely, the sacerdotal power. That which is essential we must take to be the part of the Church which is alone worth preservation; that which is accidental, notwithstanding the many privileges attaching to the accident, we must, in the coming contest, cheerfully abandon. Hitherto we have been brought up in the idea, that there is between the two parts an inseparable connexion. Church and State has been a cry of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century, to which no one, whatever he thought secretly, dared to raise a voice of objection openly. But this mysterious charm is fast dissolving now. Whether the Church is still to be a Parliamentary Church is a question that is now-a-days continually agitated and discussed. Whether the ‘Establishment,’ as a mere legal affair, is to take the lead and supersede the Church as Christ’s spouse, is now a question. The Establishment, as such, is a statesman’s tool; it is his creature, his instrument, his food; but the Church, as such, is of a very different complexion. She is his opponent, his mistress, his superior and ruler. She is not under him as coming from Cæsar, but above him as coming from God. You endeavour, my lord, to confound two palpably distinct things. The royal supremacy every loyal Englishman would cheerfully acknowledge, provided it be limited to the ‘Establishment,’ and that government of the Church which is permissible by the law of Christ; but when it is claimed over the Church, either in doctrine or discipline, we retire to our citadel and defy it. ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ The royal supremacy in civil matters, as well as in ecclesiastical matters, as long as they are merely ecclesiastical and not spiritual, also in all temporal matters, causes, and trials, arising out of them, we cheerfully acknowledge; but the royal supremacy in the doctrines of our blessed Lord, in the discipline of the Church within, in the regulation of her pastors, in the enunciation of her doctrines, we utterly and explicitly deny. This matter has been well considered, and the exact shape and form of words by which I would embrace the idea of the royal supremacy is embodied in the following propositions, to which I beg your lordship’s attention, in order that, if I am right, my flock may know, as far as I am myself concerned, what is meant by denying the royal supremacy, and what is not meant:—

“I. I have hitherto acknowledged, and do now acknowledge, the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters to be a supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the temporal accidents of spiritual things.

“II. I do not, and in conscience cannot, acknowledge in the Crown the power recently exercised to hear and judge in appeal the internal state or merits of spiritual questions touching doctrine or discipline, the custody of which is committed to the Church alone by the law of Christ.

“III. I therefore, for the relief of my own conscience, hereby publicly declare that I acknowledge the royal supremacy in the sense above stated, and in no other.

“These propositions, I believe, have been subscribed by about one thousand eight hundred clergy.

“It would be well indeed, my lord, that your lordship, and those who agree with you in your theory of an act of Parliament Church, should consider the probable effects of straining too far your idea of governing her by a power external to herself. It would be well that you do so before it be too late. Remember that we stand in the ‘*via mediæ*’ between two great opponents, on either side, who distinctly and utterly repudiate your theory; I mean the great body of Protestant Dissenters on the one side, and the great and increasing body of the Roman Catholic Church on the other; that it has happened of late, and must happen more and more frequently, as time goes on, that disaffected members of the English Church will be continually thrown off her body into one or other of these inimical portions of the religious world surrounding her—as, for instance, Mr. Baptist Noel to the side of Dissent, and many of the most learned and most holy of our clergy (too many for me now to name) to the side of Rome. Remember that by this we are gradually attenuated, weakened, and emptied out, and shall soon be not much more than dry bones. If this be your object, well indeed you are working towards it; if not, then let me supplicate you—my voice, indeed, is but poor, but yet it is a voice—let me supplicate you to pause before you bring us to this dread alternative, either secession from the communion of the Church of England, or resistance to the temporal power for conscience sake. The miseries consequent on such an alternative—the miseries of the poor, the hearts of thousands broken, the hopes of thousands dispersed; scepticism, doubts, misgivings of all truth, infidelity—these, my lord, are the inevitable results.

“If you drive the Church out of England, the Church will rise up, my lord, elsewhere. If you destroy her

as a component part of the institutions of this country, you will have her riding over your head triumphant, in that foreign prince, whom then you will have good reason, according to your own principles, to dread. The Rock of Ages does not depend upon the Crown or any temporal prince, nor rest for its security on Acts of Parliament. Ask the Dissenters what they think of this doctrine. Ask Dr. Cumming. Would he submit his Presbyterian doctrines to be judged by the civil and temporal lawyers of her Majesty's Privy Council? He never has done so, and he never will. Ask the Wesleyans, the Independents, the Baptists, would they permit their doctrines to be overhauled in your courts of common or ecclesiastical law? Of course they would not. Well, then, where is the justice of talking about civil and religious liberty, if the State is brought in to rule matters which do not belong, never have belonged, and never can belong to it? The Church's infallibility goes along with the Church's supremacy. They are one and the same. They are above all earthly canons, out of sight, and beyond the reach of all the Acts of Parliament that England ever had; beyond all the sovereigns that ever reigned throughout the world; beyond, in short, every power and every will, every strength and every dominion, save that only which is of the King of kings and Lord of lords.

"What is the general character of the Church of England, its general tone, the beating of its pulse, the circulation of its blood? Statesmen, as such, know very well. And how to rule her and make her subject either to the blandishments of worldly delights or the threats of worldly violence, they know very well. Its Erastian spirit—its barren, and, generally speaking, lukewarm care for souls when contrasted with the Roman Church—we feel humbled in acknowledging. What a bitter and biting sarcasm that is, my lord, of the new Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, when he speaks of conceding the parks and the palaces of Westminster to us, regarding the lanes and streets of the poor for his archbishopric. In parallel with this, I would ask you to read what Dr. Arnold says. He speaks of the Church of England as never recovering the 'aristocratic and regal selfishness of its birth.' ['Life and Correspondence,' vol. ii., p. 382.] I quote Dr. Arnold, let me remind you, because he is one of your own.

"But now, to bring this letter to a conclusion. I would say to you, my lord, in the language of Hosius to the Emperor Constantine,—

"Stay, I beseech you. Remember that you are a mortal man. Fear the day of judgment. Keep your hands clean against it. Meddle not with Church matters. Far from advising us about them, rather seek instruction from us. We may not bear rule upon earth; you, O Emperor, may not bear rule in the things of worship. I write this from a care for your soul.—Ath. Hist. Arian. ad Mon. 44.

"I pray God, my lord—even yet daily more and more will I pray—that you may be spared from being the instrument, under God's hand, for the destruction of the Church of England. It is a fearful thought for a man to dwell upon, that possibly he may be the appointed channel in the councils of God for some sweeping calamity about to descend upon this great nation. I presume you would really think that the loss of her Church would be a sweeping calamity. Yet the loss of her Church is by no means, at the present moment, in her peculiar position, an impossible thing. May I, a very humble individual, entreat you to pause, to stay your hand, to arrest the downward course of her fall, before it be too late. For myself, and those around me here, while we will give ourselves only the more sedulously to prayer and sacraments, and the good works of the poor, we will not give way one single inch in the duties we owe to the Church. The spirit of Pilate may be in the rulers, the spirit of Judas in the brethren, the spirit of Gallio in the nobles, but yet let us hope that there may be the spirit of Peter and Paul in the priests and bishops of the fold. For ourselves, the greater fierceness of the people's madness, so much the greater our patience; the more violent their outcries of wrath, the more earnest and the longer our prayers.

"I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's humble servant and parish priest,

"WM. J. E. BENNETT."

LETTER FROM SIR B. HALL, BART., M.P., TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

The following letter has been addressed to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury by Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., M.P. :—

"MY LORD,—At this time of public excitement, when the Protestants of this country are expressing the indignation they naturally feel at the division of the kingdom into episcopal districts by the Pope, to be presided over by a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster—when the Prime Minister of this country considers it expedient to make his sentiments on the subject of Papal domination known to the public through the medium of a letter addressed to the Bishop of Durham—when the newly-appointed cardinal gives publicity to his views in an appeal to the people of this realm—when bishops address their clergy, and deans and chapters are in a state of unparalleled consternation, all complaining, but none suggesting any practical remedy, contenting themselves with venting their spleen against the disciples of Pusey and the congregations of St. Barnabas—I venture to take the liberty of addressing myself to your Grace, as a humble member of the Church of which your Grace, under the Crown, is the head, and as one of the laity to whom your Grace has appealed, to offer a few remarks upon the present subject. It is not my intention at this time to give any opinion as to whether the Pope, guided by the advice of Dr. Wiseman, Dr. Maclhale, and Cardinal Fransoni, has acted discreetly in the step he has taken; neither shall I enter upon the question of the legality of such a step—that subject must be brought under the consideration of Parliament, when the Prime Minister introduces those measures which (from his letter) he appears to have in contemplation. My object is to show that there are more causes than one for the present interference on the part of the Pope. I am quite aware (as has been frequently observed by others) that one of the causes which may have led to the appointment of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country is the fact that, amongst the clergy of our Church there are some who, although Roman Catholics at heart, cleave too much to the good things of this world, which their present preferments afford them, to have the honesty fully to avow the opinions which they entertain in reference to another Church, antagonistic to that from which they derive all their worldly advantages, but who still cling to their offices and emoluments, at the same time that, by their preaching and practices, they make converts to their own real opinions, for which

unworthy conduct they may perhaps believe that the Church with which they are mentally united may be able hereafter to give them absolution, but into whose communion they will not at present enter, lest they should lose their station and be deprived of their stipends. But this is not all; although if we merely read the letter of the Prime Minister, and peruse the letters and speeches of the bishops and clergy which daily appear in the newspapers, it might be supposed that Puseyism, and Puseyism alone, had led to the Papal bull which has recently been issued from the Vatican. If the Prime Minister and the bishops are correct in their belief that Puseyism is one of the principal causes (if not the only cause) of the measures recently adopted by the Court of Rome, why have those great authorities been so careless and so indifferent, as regards the welfare of our Church and the maintenance of Protestantism, as to allow Puseyism to gain so great an ascendancy, by permitting those clergymen who are now designated as 'traitors to the Established Church,' to continue ministers of the reformed religion of that Church? Your Grace, in a letter addressed to the clergy upon this subject, dated November 21, 1850, says:—

"Ten years have elapsed since I thought it necessary to warn the clergy of another diocese against the dangers of adopting principles which, when carried out, tend naturally to those Romish errors against which our forefathers protested, and which were renounced by the Anglican Church. The result has proved this judgment was not harsh, or the warning premature; on the contrary, certain of our clergy, professing to follow up those principles, have proceeded onward, from one Romish tenet and one Romish practice to another, till in some congregations all that is distinctive in Protestant doctrine or Protestant worship has disappeared."

"Many of the other bishops have likewise denounced the observances of the Puseyites as dangerous to the Establishment; but no measure has been suggested in Parliament, and (as far as I can learn) no steps have been taken out of Parliament, to devise means to deprive these so called 'traitors of the Church' of their benefices and preferments which they continue to hold, and who are thus maintained and encouraged by the very Establishment which it is declared on all sides that they are undermining. Possibly the reason of this apparent apathy, this marvellous negligence, is, that unfortunately amongst the hierarchy of our Church there are men who have themselves a strong tendency to Puseyism; and if this is the case, no real good can be effected till such men are removed from their high and influential positions. If the existing laws will not reach the case, new measures ought long ago to have been submitted to Parliament, and the 'ten years' during which, according to your Grace's letter, Puseyism has been so dangerous, and during which it has been fostered either by the connivance or by the indifference of our ecclesiastical rulers, should not have been permitted to pass away without an effectual check being put to its advancement.

"Your grace must not suppose, from the declaration of these opinions, that I would ever advocate the persecution of any body of men because they profess opinions at variance with the principles of the Church of which I am a member; but merely that I should have great satisfaction in being a party to any legislative enactment which would deprive persons holding those opinions (whether bishops or minor clergy) of their present preferment in the Established Church, and facilitate their entrance within the pale of that other Church whose forms they observe, and whose principles they uphold. But at present all these gentlemen continue in the enjoyment of the preferment derived from our Church; and even the Rev. Doctor from whom the new sect is named, notwithstanding the opinions expressed by the Prime Minister and by your Grace and the Bishops, is still Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and a professor of that University, and continues to preach in every diocese in the kingdom! The Puseyites allege that they act in conformity with the Rubric; and there is no doubt that there are ordinances in the Rubric which have been unaltered since the time of Edward VI., and had become obsolete, but, having been revived by the Puseyites, and being consequently the occasion of schism and confusion in the Established Church, the Rubric ought to have been revised long ago. But Mr. Bennett, in an explanation which he gave in a sermon delivered in St. Barnabas Church on Sunday, November 24, says (and says most truly), that everything he did had been sanctioned by the Bishop of the diocese; and it appears by the report of proceedings in the public papers in reference to the consecration of St. Barnabas by the Bishop of London, that his lordship was assisted in the performance of his duties on that day by the Bishops of Oxford, Salisbury, and Brechin, by the Archdeacons Manning and Thorpe, and by Dr. Pusey; and that his lordship entreated Mr. Bennett for all he had done, not only in his sermon, but in proposing his health at 'the Feast' which took place after the consecration. Mr. Bennett has certainly just reason to complain, if he is to be condemned and not his diocesan.

"I am, however, of opinion that the Pope has been induced to issue his last bull not solely in consequence of the advances of the Puseyites, but of the general discontent with regard to the Established Church which exists in this country, arising from the very unequal, very unjust, and most improvident distribution and management of ecclesiastical preferment and ecclesiastical property. Dr. Wiseman, in his recent address to the people of England, made strong allusions to the distribution of our Church property. Much was said upon the subject during the last session of Parliament, and it is certainly desirable that any petitions which may be presented to the Legislature, in reference to the late Papal bull and the progress of Puseyism, should contain a prayer that a thorough inquiry may be made into the property of the Established Church. Some of the bishops assert that the property of the Church is vested in themselves, and that Parliament has no right to make any inquiry as to the extent or management of that property. This assertion may be found most plainly stated in letters, addressed by the Bishops of Exeter, Bangor, Carlisle, Gloucester and Bristol, Rochester, Salisbury, Oxford (now Bath and Wells), and the late Bishop of St. David's, to the chairman of the Church Leases Committee; and the Bishop of Exeter, in Appendix to Report on Select Committee on Church Leases, page 568, says, 'If inquiry was authorised, even by act of the Legislature, he should deem it a most unconstitutional and tyrannical inquisition into his property;' and he positively refused to give any information to a committee of the House of Commons. The letters from the other bishops were to a similar purpose; but it is not probable that these opinions will be generally acquiesced in by the people of Great Britain. And the committee, in their final report, dated 6th of May, 1839 (*eleven years and a half ago*), recommend the abolition of the injurious system of fines upon leases for lives, and also upon leases for terms. The people of this kingdom have a right to consider that the property of the Church is only bestowed upon the bishops and clergy as stewards and guardians for the benefit of the community at large, of which Church the laity form a part, and that Parliament ought to be

informed of every acre of land, and the value of each acre, belonging to the Church; that the system of fines taken on the granting of leases ought to be abolished; that Parliament ought to know the amount received from fines, the rents at which the property has been let, and the names of the parties to whom the several properties have been leased; that Parliament should insist upon an immediate abolition of all those disgraceful pluralities to some of which public attention has lately been drawn, and which cast a stigma on the discipline of our Church. In times like the present, when it is so vitally important to show that the conduct of our hierarchy is worthy of the faith they profess, I would most respectfully suggest that nothing would have so powerful an effect on the public mind, nothing would tend so speedily to strengthen the Established Church, to create confidence in her rulers, and to recall wanderers to her fold, as the archbishops and bishops of the United Kingdom, and other high dignitaries of the Church, *anticipating* prospective enactments of the Legislature, and at once proceeding to the revision of their incomes, and to such a redistribution of ecclesiastical property as would enable the working clergy to receive not less than 200*l.* a-year each, so that there might no longer be that enormous disproportion which now exists between those who have the superintendence of pastors and those who have the care of souls. It is undeniable that great abuses exist in the management of the ecclesiastical property, that the incomes of the high dignitaries of our Church far exceed in amount those of any other Christian nation.

"The highest dignitary of the Church in France, the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, has, I believe, only 2,000*l.* a year, and a residence; the suffragan bishops have incomes varying from 500*l.* to 1,000*l.* a year. The highest ecclesiastical dignitary in Prussia, the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne, has also only 2,000*l.* a year, and a residence; but by a Parliamentary paper (No. 544, session 1845, and reprinted last session as No. 310) it appears that for the seven years ending the 31st of December, 1843, the total gross incomes of twenty-five archbishops and bishops of England and Wales amounted to no less a sum than *one million four hundred and eleven thousand six hundred and sixty-nine pounds one shilling* (1,411,669*l.* 1*s.*), whilst their net income was one million one hundred and twenty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five pounds nine shillings and twopence (1,121,457*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*). The income of the bishopric of Lichfield is not included, as it appears the agent of the bishop had absconded, so that no return could be made. But no account has ever been rendered of the items comprised in the large sum of *two hundred and ninety thousand one hundred and eighty-three pounds eleven shillings and tenpence* (290,183*l.* 11*s.* 10*d.*), which constitutes the difference between gross and net income. Another seven years will have elapsed on the last day of this year, and when Parliament meets a return of the gross and net incomes of the archbishops and bishops for that period must again be made; but vast as it must necessarily appear, it will be recollectcd that, *in addition*, and within a very few years, 60,000*l.* has been expended on the palace at Lambeth, and 143,014*l.* on the episcopal residences and demesnes of eight dioceses only, whilst in those eight dioceses only 5,259*l.* could be found for the benefit of the working clergy by the augmentation of small livings, in which eight sees there are *eighty-five livings under fifty pounds a year, and 417 livings between fifty and one hundred pounds a year!* Surely, my lord, these things ought not to have been; and who can wonder that disaffection exists towards the Church when its dignitaries have been the main cause of such proceedings? I must again refer to the passage in your grace's letter to the clergy of the diocese of Canterbury, in which your grace observes that 'the laity must lend their aid, and supply the means of adding to the number of clergy.' I am sure your grace will admit that upon all occasions when assistance has been required the laity have come forward nobly, and been ready and willing to take a full share in every good work; but the laity have a right to expect on the other hand that the bishops of our Church will no longer delay making the ecclesiastical property available for the true interests of the Church. If the incomes of the two archbishops were reduced to 6,000*l.* a year each, and 50,000*l.* a year was assigned as an income between the other twenty-three bishops, there would by this reduction alone be at once an annual surplus fund of 139,667*l.*, which would provide 695 clergymen with salaries of 200*l.* a year each. We have also a case before us of an archdeacon in this diocese of London enjoying four pieces of preferment, amounting to at least 5,300*l.* a year, besides three or four houses, to all of which he has been appointed *within the last ten years*. There is another archdeacon who has 6,200*l.* a year; and if the incomes of these two archdeacons were reduced to 1,000*l.* a year each, there would be a surplus from these two pluralists alone of no less than 9,500*l.* a year, which would be sufficient to supply incomes of 200*l.* a year each for *forty-seven more additional pastors* from these two sources of reduction alone; and after leaving a much larger amount of income for the archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons referred to than would be received by the dignitaries of any other Christian Church in the known world, there would remain an annual fund for the maintenance of no less than 745 additional pastors! As long as such inconsistencies exist, it is not fair that the laity should be continually called upon for pecuniary assistance to provide pastors and to build churches, when it can be shown that the funds of the Church, if properly appropriated and administered, are amply sufficient for both these purposes.

"It is a matter of unfortunate notoriety that during the unchecked prosperity of the Ecclesiastical Commission (the proceedings of which body have caused greater disaffection towards the Church than either Puseyite preaching or Popish bulls), the episcopal body assembled and admitted that many of the incomes attached to their sees were excessive; but, instead of making those reductions which, considering the state the Church was then in, they ought to have done, they determined in every single instance to retain the fullest amount of their emoluments, but to pass an act by which their successors should in some cases have a reduction; though in others a material increase. Surely, my lord, if the episcopal body deemed their clerical incomes too large, they ought to have made some present personal sacrifice for the interest of the Church—and this is what is required at the present moment, and we (the laity) have a right to call upon the episcopal body to make these sacrifices, when they are continually calling on the laity for assistance to support the Church. By the act to which I have referred, it was intended that the bishops appointed subsequent to the passing of that act, as well as the Bishop of Durham, should have certain fixed incomes. Such was the spirit of the act and the intention of the Legislature; but I need only instance the case of the Bishop of Durham to show how that spirit has been violated, as, instead of receiving only the 8,000*l.* a year contemplated by this act, I believe the right reverend prelate (of course a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission) has occasionally received double that income. It is, however, of very little use to provide pastors, or to build churches, unless the churches existing, and those to be built, are to be used

by the laity. According to a Parliamentary paper, No. 4 of last session, it appears that out of the 258 churches within the diocese of Llandaff there are 153 in which divine service is performed only once a week. What has been the consequence? On Sunday, the 13th of last month, the congregations in every church and chapel used for divine worship, according to the forms of the Established Church, in thirty-four districts in the diocese of Llandaff, were counted; the population of these districts amount to no less than 173,139, there is church accommodation for 17,440, and yet there was spare room in those churches on that day for 9,591. So that out of this vast population there were only 7,229 persons who attended the service of the Established Church on the day I have named. In the adjoining diocese of St. David's, out of 484 churches there is the vast number of 353 in which also only one service is performed; and I have reason to believe that in the last-named diocese there are churches where the word of God is only preached once in a fortnight! Is it, then, surprising that there is disaffection towards the Church, or that the churches are deserted, and the Dissenting chapels filled? Allow me to ask you, my lord, would the Roman Catholics act thus towards their flocks? And yet it is made a subject of wonder that the Pope endeavours to gain a footing in this neglected country, and considers the present moment peculiarly favourable for so doing.

“But this is not all. I wish I could end here. But we have collegiate establishments as well as churches—for instance, the collegiate church of Brecon, in the diocese of St. David's, to which large revenues are attached, and of which the Bishop is dean, having also an unusually large staff of prebends. This collegiate establishment was placed there ‘to improve the morals of the King's liege subjects,’ by ‘supplying scriptural education to the poor, and thus advancing the honour and glory of God.’ A pamphlet was published in 1846, describing its condition at that time, and it does not appear that any reform has taken place, or any official inquiry has been instituted into the state of the case during the four years which have since elapsed. The writer says that the roof of this collegiate church had then been long falling upon the pavement, and allowed to remain there. No service had been performed since 1839, the cause of its suspension having been that the roof was at that time too insecure to allow the duty to be performed with safety. No prebend had kept residence for twenty years—the school has been discontinued since 1845, and there was then neither school, service, nor lecture. The old rickety doors belonging to the entrance of this collegiate church were fastened by a chain and padlock, which the person who had charge of the ruins, and who retained the nominal office of clerk or sexton, was obliged to find at his own cost; and he had (in 1846) not received any salary since September, 1844, when the registrar gave him 5*l.* for his services as clerk, and 10*s.* for washing the surplice. The piece of ground adjoining the old fabric, which is believed to be the burial-ground of the college, was then let as pasture by the Bishop, at 16*l.* a-year, and a circus for horsemanship was almost every year allowed to be erected in the centre of this hallowed spot.

“Such is the state of one of our collegiate Church establishments in Wales, with a Bishop for its dean and non-resident clergymen for its prebends. I merely mention it because it is an instance of the neglect and mal-appropriation of Church property existing within twenty-five miles of my own residence; but I fear too many others may be found of a similar nature in other parts of the kingdom. The diocese of St. David's is within your grace's province of Canterbury. This is not the first time that ‘Christ College of Brecon’ has been brought under the notice of an Archbishop of Canterbury. It has before been the subject of complaint to one of your grace's predecessors, who reformed the then existing abuses, and insisted on the performance of the conditions enjoined by the royal charter; and your grace will at once perceive from the description here given that a fresh mandate is necessary. Your grace is, I believe, aware (as I am informed the subject has been under the notice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners) that the Bishop of St. David's, not content with the income of 4,500*l.* assigned him by the act of Parliament, and his palace, appointed himself dean of the ‘Collegiate Church of Christ, Brecon,’ and of course receives the emoluments of that office, though contrary to the intentions of the Legislature, and yet permits this collegiate establishment, which was originally endowed to ‘improve the morals of the King's liege subjects,’ to fall into ruin and decay, and thus be a disgrace instead of a blessing to the neighbourhood. I do not believe there are any Puseyites in the neighbourhood of Brecon, but the Pope has placed this neglected district under the charge of his newly-created Bishop of Merthyr Tydfil. I think your grace will admit that the instances I have adduced sufficiently demonstrate that Puseyism has not been the only cause of the late interference of the Roman Pontiff; and, I venture to ask, may not the conduct of our own ecclesiastical rulers have led not only to Puseyism, but to ‘Papal Aggression?’

“Finally, I beseech you, my lord, on behalf of that Church of which your grace is the chief dignitary, not merely to direct your attention to the abuses which have crept into the Establishment, and which can no longer be concealed from the public eye, but to exercise the power attached to your high office for the purpose of rendering the discipline of our Church as unimpeachable as the faith we profess is pure.

“I am aware that enactments of the Legislature are absolutely necessary to carry through any effectual plan of Church reform, and, as we must look to your grace to introduce or support such enactments, I venture to make one suggestion.

“In the Protestant countries of Scotland, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, and the whole of Germany (either Lutheran or Calvinistic), the laity have either the right of election of their pastors or a veto; and even under the old system in Prussia, no patron, not even the King, could force a nominee upon a parish if half of the independent members in communion with the Church objected to him; but in Great Britain alone no such trust is reposed in the laity, although the mass of the people are undeniably Protestant, and worthy of confidence. In my opinion, an Act of Parliament to give the laity this very reasonable privilege would (together with your grace's good example and powerful assistance to carry out the reforms before suggested), in your double capacity of chief dignitary of the Church as well as of a legislator in Parliament) speedily replace the Established Church on a basis too firm for any further cause of apprehension from the disciples of Pusey or the aggressions of Rome.

“I have the honour to be, my lord, with great respect,

“Your grace's most obedient and faithful servant,

“London, Dec. 3.”

“B. HALL.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

SERMON BY CARDINAL WISEMAN AT ST. GEORGE'S CATHOLIC CHURCH, SOUTHWARK;

LECTURE ON THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY,
BY CARDINAL WISEMAN;

LETTERS FROM DR. CUMMING AND MR. BOWYER;
AND THE BISHOPS' ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

A SERMON

PREACHED AT ST. GEORGE'S CATHOLIC CHURCH, SOUTHWARK,
BY CARDINAL WISEMAN,
ON SUNDAY MORNING, DEC. 8, 1850.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. "The hand of the Lord is upon me because the Spirit of the Lord hath anointed me. He hath sent me to preach to the meek, to heal the contrite of heart, to preach release to the captive, and deliverance to him that is shut up, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and to comfort them that mourn:" words taken from the 61st chapter of the prophet Isaias, the first and second verses.

These words, my dear brethren, are spoken of the sublime ministry of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus, the true Priest according to the order of Melchisedek, upon whom was the hand indeed of the Lord, as he was anointed with the fulness of every grace and blessing by the Spirit of God, to go forth and preach redemption to the captive, not from bonds of this earth, release of the prisoner, not from the chains which bind the flesh, but freedom from the captivity of sin, redemption from the slavery of the Devil. He it was who came "to preach the acceptable year," the great jubilee of eternal salvation, who made the whole of that period which from Him should elapse until the end of time a season of mercy, and of grace, and of acceptance before God, in which men would be sure to find forgiveness, remission, and all that is needful to conduct them even to eternal life.

But our blessed Redeemer has been pleased to communicate to his ministers in the Church that same priesthood which essentially belongs to Himself—has been pleased to make us, however humble, partakers of some of that unction of the Holy Spirit, that anointing of sanctification and grace, which enables us, through our unworthy ministry, to be the means of grace to others; and He has sent us forth upon that same errand of mercy and forgiveness. He has bade us likewise make this our great, our principal occupation—to heal those that are contrite or bruised of heart, to preach consolation to those that are in mourning, to announce to the captive that through the redemption of the Son of God his bonds may be broken, and he may be made free in Christ Jesus his only Saviour and Lord.

But while there is no season, no time, no day, in which the Catholic Church does not perform these acts of ministration of peace, although there is no time or season in which she does not, from her pulpits and her altars, proclaim that at whatever hour, at whatever moment, the sinner may turn from his evil ways to seek from his God forgiveness, it shall be given to him, still hath she most wisely, following the examples and the precedents given to us in the institutions of the old law, appointed certain times and seasons when more particularly the doctrine of repentance should be preached, and men should be invited to look well into the wants and necessities of their souls, and to come and seek their remedy.

And now, my brethren, I feel almost as if I were casting a cloud upon the true festivity of this day when I announce to you that I am going to speak upon this subject; for I am sure that the thoughts of all you, my dear Christian Catholic brethren and children, are filled this day with exultation and joy, that you have crowded here because you know that on this great, this patron festival of our diocese, we wish most particularly to show our gratitude to Almighty God for the benefits which He has bestowed upon us so lately, and especially to renew, what has been authoritatively done for us, to renew in our hearts, and with the expression of our own lips, that earnest, deep, affectionate devotion towards the blessed mother of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus which now more than at any time deserves to be openly proclaimed and professed by Catholic mouth, when outrage and blasphemy are most loud in her dishonour, and in that, consequently, of Him to whom she gave birth. But, my brethren, you know that "the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom;" you know that forgiveness should precede thanks-

giving ; you know that never shall we rejoice properly until we have purged our hearts from sin, not merely from deadly sin, but from the lurking leaven of sin within us ; and therefore I feel it to have been wisely ordained that this day, which is to us a day of rejoicing, should be at the same time the commencement of that brief but important season, our jubilee, which the holy Catholic Church has appointed to be kept before the end of the year. And, therefore, standing here this day, it is my duty to proclaim to you, as the prophet speaks, that year of acceptance and of salvation. Not, indeed, that under the present circumstances we are to enjoy that full period of our nearer approach to God, but as in his prophet Ezekiel God was pleased to say that He would give days for years, so has it pleased the Sovereign Pontiff, considering the position and circumstances of this time, to permit us to condense and concentrate, as it were, in few days, that piety which at other times would have been diffused over the period of an entire year.

I will be brief, then, dearly beloved, in first explaining why such a season should be appointed, and then encouraging you to enter upon it with those dispositions which it requires.

There is a two-fold object in the jubilee which is periodically proclaimed by the Church. The first is, the consideration of the good of individuals ; the second is, general benefit to the Church and to the world. We know, dearly beloved, by our own experience, how short a time we persevere in good even after we have made the strongest resolution to attempt the work. We know how, by degrees, the rust of human affections creeps, as it were, over the machinery of the faculties ; how we become more remiss in good works ; how, perhaps, by degrees, even the working of our own spiritual life becomes deranged. We attempt from time to time, most profitably, no doubt, and with most beneficial results, to amend our faults. We are summoned each month, each week, to look into our failings and transgressions, and to obtain forgiveness for them ; and thus we preserve ourselves, indeed, from falling into that which is more grievous or more habitual. But still, even the best-regulated heart, even the purest soul, will be conscious of that dropping of the impure dew of this world which accumulates within us, and so, increasing more and more, too often ends in those who are most confident being carried away by the torrent-violence of passion and hatred headlong towards the precipice of destruction. For our first failures, for our frequent transgressions, there are the remedies of the Church at hand. Her balm is ever at hand to be poured into the first wound or rend of the soul ; her ministers are ever nigh to bandage, and carefully to close up, any more grievous infliction ; but at length it may be that these ordinary means cease to act upon us, that we can turn our backs upon them, and forget that there is remedy for sin, that sin becomes our master, that we are the captive and the prisoner to whom release and deliverance must be more solemnly preached. Then comes the Church, from time to time, in stronger accents, with more severe menaces, with more stringent urgency, with more enlargement of her powers of grace, with more tender invitations and calls of mercy, and endeavours to stir up those who have in the past neglected their most important duty, that of preserving themselves from sin, to make a gracious, and great, and noble effort, which will free them at once, break their bonds, and restore them to health and grace.

Such, my brethren, is one of the great objects of the jubilee. It is to call forth sinners from their slumber ; it is to blow in their very ears the trumpet of judgment ; for you know that in the old law the priest announced the jubilee by that solemn music which was sufficiently strong to overthrow the very walls of Jericho, and so now it is an announcement of the divine judgment, of His vengeance that is slumbering, which is made use of to awake him that sleeps in sin, and bid him come once more to reconciliation with his God, and to begin to walk in the way of His commandments. This is for the sinner. And for those who do not feel themselves so immersed in vice or crime as to require this more sudden or more energetic arousing of their dormant conscience, even for them likewise is such a period of reconsideration of themselves, and of remodelling, if I may so speak, of their very heart, and shaping and forming it more truly in the mould of the Gospel ; even for them is this turning themselves to God in weeping and mourning for the sins likewise of others, as well as for their own past offences, most important and most salutary. So that the Church makes no distinction when she proclaims her jubilee ; she commands all to go through that process of purification which is more or less needful for all ; for who is there who hath not sinned, and doth not need the glory of God ? She commands all, therefore, to frequent the tribunal of confession. She commands them to approach the holy table, whence vigour for a new life may be derived ; she orders them to join in prayers and supplications for themselves and for others, and thus unites her children for a few days round the altar of God, as the priests and people were summoned of old, there to feed and gather strength ; she commands all to beseech God, in mercy, to blot out and drive away sin and iniquity from the midst of His congregation.

But, dearly beloved, besides this duty, which regards our own consciences, our individual salvation, it is but too true that the evils and calamities which oppress the world go on ever from small beginnings increasing until at length they become such as may provoke the judgment of God, or as already have taken the form of a scourge with which He afflicts us. For who does not know how ignorance, and poverty, and crime, and hidden vice may go on more and more accumulating in the depths of society, which the hand of

legislation, and the most energetic efforts of philanthropy, are not able to reach? And, on the other hand, side by side with this dark and dismal abyss of suffering and of wretchedness, there may be luxury, and oppression, and open crime, and defiance of God, and infidelity, not of heart only but of lip. And this will go on more and more increasing until it shall become a deluge that overspreads the world, and brings down one of those great and tremendous crises which, like the deluge, or an invasion of barbarians, or pestilence, or war, desolates nations, and makes them at length feel that the measure of their iniquities hath been filled up. Then is not the Church a kind, and merciful, and most loving mother, who bids us arrest our career, whether we be rich or poor, and for some time devote ourselves, not merely to the reforming, as far as is in our power, of these threatening evils, but to lift up our hands and our hearts together, the whole Church, in one solemn concert of pleading for mercy, to beg of God to avert the evils which threaten us, to remove them clean from us, or at least so to delay them as to give us time for repentance and amendment? This is one of the great objects of a jubilee in the Catholic Church; to summon the whole of the faithful throughout the world to earnest supplications that God would avert from the public weal, from society, from the State, and from the world the chastisements which His judgments may have prepared, or which they may be about to prepare, for them.

Such, dear brethren, are the two great objects for which the Church this day invites you to unite during the coming fortnight in her deep and earnest prayer. But I feel that with regard to us, my dear Catholic children, this has come most opportunely; not because I consider that any real or great evil has come upon us, or has threatened us, but because I think God has bestowed on us so great a blessing that it is our duty to dispose our hearts to receive it with becoming dispositions, and a blessing from God shall fall upon an humble, upon a contrite, but at the same time upon a purified and simple heart. And therefore I believe that you will draw down the grace of God upon the work which He has so mercifully commenced in our Catholic Church here in England, if you will, during these days particularly, entreat him to make us worthy of it, worthy of its blessings, worthy of its graces. You know not yet—you cannot know—to what extent these will flow; but experience will show you how truly it has been a gift from above, granted to us for our own sakes, and for the better practice of our holy religion, and the better sanctification of our own souls. But it will have also another beneficial effect if, during these fourteen or fifteen days that follow, you will occupy yourselves exclusively, as far as your ordinary duties will permit it, with the care of your own souls, and with the interests of another and a better world; if, during this time, you will shut your ears to calumny that may distract, and your eyes to whatever may be painful or afflicting to you, and remember that this is one of the great privileges of our holy religion, that as its object is to lead us to heaven, so, during our mortal pilgrimage, it brings heaven down to us, and enables us to walk in the light of such faint glimpses of its glory as may be caught. It has the power to abstract our thoughts, our imaginations, and our souls from the things of this world, and to make them dwell and converse for a time with God and his angels. So this is one of those happy moments in which your holy mother the Church invites you to do this, and bids you further to think not of what the world may be doing around you, especially what it may be doing concerning you, but to live, to live with your blessed Saviour, to live with his glorious saints, to live with his dear and ever-blessed mother, to live with those souls of the just who form a part of the living Church as much as if they were still upon the earth; to live with them in thoughts and aspirations, and holy joy and thanksgiving to God, and in all that union of souls and affections which you know is to be obtained only in the Catholic Church, and in the presence of that adorable Saviour who lives amongst us in order that we may partake of his blessed society.

And my brethren, in this way you will indeed close the year in the true spirit in which the Church wishes you to open that which is to be great and prosperous and glorious for you. You will afflict your souls at the close, in order that you may cancel the sins and offences of the past. You will open your hearts again to all the joys of your holy religion in the nativity of your blessed Saviour, and you will be permitted, in hope, in joy, and in thankfulness, to partake of the blessings which God has given you. And this little passing affliction of the contrite and humble heart will prepare you for the joy of forgiveness. Those tears which are shed at the feet of our blessed Redeemer, with the Holy Magdalene, will purchase for you that expression of cordial love which your blessed Redeemer refuses to no penitent; that desire of greater participation and closer union with Him which will occupy the thoughts of those who need not so much this strong and fiery purgation, will draw them into a closer embrace and union with our dear Redeemer, into the happy society of those who, like John and Mary, were privileged to love him, and who, consequently, were privileged more closely to minister to him, and to be numbered among his friends.

Thus shall we all, dearly beloved, comply with the exhortations of our dear mother the Church; thus shall we fulfil her wishes; thus shall we respond to her desires for our eternal salvation; and thus will God hear our prayers and pour upon you and upon all, pour upon this glorious Church—pour upon this generous and powerful country, pour down upon the whole world,

however oppressed or however afflicted it may be—the blessings which each may want, blessings here upon earth, but still more those blessings which alone are worthy of our desire, and which alone are to be found with God.

The following account of the morning service is taken from the *Morning Herald* of December 9th:—

“As it was generally understood that his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman would preach in this church yesterday, the attendance of persons anxious to hear him was, as might be expected, most numerous; indeed, at ten o'clock there was not a seat to be obtained, and forms and chairs were placed in the nave to afford accommodation to the still-increasing congregation. The seats on the side-aisles also were not only completely filled, but even the passages were densely crowded; and shortly after eleven o'clock the church was filled in every part by a highly-respectable, orderly, and decorous congregation, many of whom were evidently not members of the Roman Catholic faith. It was understood that there were several distinguished members of the Romish religion present; but, from the crowded state of the church, it was impossible to obtain any particulars on this point.

“The altar was lighted up with numerous tapers, as is usual on the occasion of High Mass. Lights also appeared over the gate leading to the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, while in the interior a lamp was burning. The Chapel of the Virgin, at the top of the north aisle, was decorated and lighted up with numerous wax lights, in honour of “the Conception” of the Blessed Virgin, the festival of which was celebrated yesterday.

About twenty minutes past eleven o'clock the sacristy door opened, and a procession of acolytes, cross-bearers, and priests came forth, followed by Cardinal Wiseman, dressed as an archbishop, with mitre, cope, and pastoral staff. His eminence was attended by the Rev. J. Searle and the Rev. G. Wenham. As the mass was to be an episcopal one, and as the Cardinal was to officiate, he was attired in the robes of a high priest or celebrant.

“The Rev. J. Cottar was deacon, and the Rev. J. Danel was sub-deacon, assisted by the Rev. Dr. Doyle. The procession having reached the interior of the sanctuary, the archbishop commenced the mass in the usual form, and with the usual prayers, and so it proceeded until the Gospel, which was chanted by the deacon.

“The Cardinal then proceeded from the sanctuary to the pulpit, preceded by a procession of the assistant clergy, among whom were the Rev. Dr. Doyle, and the Rev. Messrs. Cottar, Danel, Francis, Searle, and Wenham. The Cardinal wore the mitre which was presented to him by his Holiness the Pope, and in his hand bore the silver crozier, symbolical of his pastoral office. He also wore the ring, and the other gorgeous appointments of his dignity.”

THE FIRST LECTURE ON THE CATHOLIC
HIERARCHY,
DELIVERED IN ST. GEORGE'S CATHOLIC CHURCH, SOUTHWARK,
BY CARDINAL WISEMAN,
ON SUNDAY EVENING, DEC. 8, 1850.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

There is a subject, my brethren, which I know to be uppermost in the minds of all here present, upon which you naturally expect that I shall address you this evening, and you would, in fact, be disappointed if I did not do so; and I cannot but consider this desire as perfectly reasonable.

The subject of the newly-established Catholic hierarchy in England has been the topic of private conversation, the theme of public discussion, for the space of more than a month; a period longer than it is usually possible to monopolise public attention for even a subject of the greatest importance. It has been discussed on all sides with great warmth and feeling. It has been represented as though, in some way or other, there were combined in it a public aggression and some private injury to multitudes and to individuals; and the appeal thus made has been certainly sufficiently strong to impress the minds of many with a sense of some general danger, as though there were either the vague anticipation of some unknown and public calamity, or the dark presentiment of some personal visitation. Plain truths and simple facts have been but little asked for; and when they have been offered they have been but little listened to. Nothing but a general excitement has held possession of the public mind, during which it has seemed almost useless to offer any explanation.

Having already endeavoured, as far as my feeble abilities go, to place before the public a simple and unadorned statement of the grounds on which this great measure has been

taken, I might perhaps retire from any further public discussion of it, and at once give myself up to the more congenial occupations of my official duties. And this day particularly, which, on account of its solemnity, and of its being the patron feast of this diocese, I had, from the very first moment of my new appointment, fixed upon as the one on which I would for the first time publicly officiate, might naturally suggest to me subjects on which to address you of a character far more pleasing to myself, and perhaps more edifying to my Catholic flock. But I feel, as I have just said, that it is reasonable in you to expect me to speak upon this subject; and were I not to do so I should be supposed to shrink from it, and that, I own to you, is an imputation which I could not bear. So long as we have violated no law, so long as we have trenched upon no man's rights, so long as we have done nothing more than we have full right to do according to the constitution of this country, and the liberties which we have obtained in common with our fellow-subjects; so long as we have been impelled by none of those base motives which have been attributed to us, we have no reason to fear or to shrink from the most plain, straightforward explanation of our conduct. And we have done none of these things. We have not, as we have been charged, violated aught that was sacred according to the laws of this country. We have not in any way been guilty of offence against its crown, against its acknowledged institutions, against the rights or privileges of any class, or of any individual.

While, therefore, I come before you, and speak plainly and simply what I know to be the truth, I will presume, or rather I will take it for granted, that you likewise have come here with the intention to listen in an unbiassed and fair mood; that you are not assembled as mere idlers, or curious people, but as honest, sober-minded, honourable men, who will allow me to speak what I know plainly, and simply, and boldly, and, if necessary, even with urgency and with feeling.

The history of the Catholic hierarchy may be summed up in very few words. It is simply this—that the Catholics of this island, who enjoy equal liberty and rights of conscience with the other inhabitants of the country, and subjects of the same crown—or so, at least, it was thought till a few weeks ago—having a full right to establish their religion according to its proper forms, being a Church episcopal by its essence, and having been till lately governed in a temporary state by vicars apostolic, have obtained from the legitimate and lawfully-recognised head of their Church the appointment of bishops having sees and titles within this kingdom. Observe, that the question is not that Catholics up till now had no bishops, and have for the first time introduced them. Had this been the case one might have imagined that the Church which until then had been the only episcopal one in the island might have considered that there was some invasion of its rights by the introduction of a new corporate body of bishops, distinct from and independent of itself. But this is not the case. The question is not one of the appointment of new bishops, it is one simply of the change of their titles. Those who before were called vicars apostolic are now bishops, and what was before called a district is now to be called a diocese.

Now, in order to place the matter more fully before you, allow me to explain further in detail, and in few words, the changes which have thus taken place. First, not one of the new bishops receives any further consecration or will receive any; he is not, and will not be, one atom more a bishop than he was before. Secondly, not one of them extends in any way the limits of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. With the exception of a few immaterial changes, such, for instance, as one county being transferred from a district of which it before formed a part to another district, the principle has been strictly adhered to of transforming the old districts into new dioceses. Thirdly, not one of the bishops acquires the smallest increase of jurisdiction or authority over clergy, or laity, or property, or trusts, or any person or thing; but if any change is made in this respect, it is that the powers before held by them are rather straitened and curtailed from what they were before. Fourthly, not one of the bishops, probably, will even change his place of residence. Fifthly, not one of them will receive, in consequence of this, the smallest addition to his income or emoluments, or any other worldly advantage; and lastly, not one of them dreams for a moment that he has acquired, in fact or in right, any additional social position, or any legal change of title or right to honour. Now this, in fact, is the real position of the Catholic hierarchy as regards its external position. Every bishop is where he was, as he was, what he was before. The difference is, that he who was called a few weeks ago Bishop of Hetalania is now called Bishop of Birmingham, that he who was Bishop of Tloa is Bishop of Liverpool; and each of them will remain exactly in the same position, as far as all possible outward relations go, as he occupied before.

Now, my brethren, give to these changes all the importance that you please; extend, as far as your imagination can carry you, the spiritual and religious consequences of this change; invest it with all possible magnitude, and, I ask you, is it possible to attribute to it the mighty effects which we have seen every day again and again attributed to it? You have been told that the rights of the Crown have been invaded; that the liberties of the nation have been perilled; that the Pope has parcelled out, as if for the first time, this country into new ecclesiastical jurisdictions; that he has usurped the rights of the supremacy, and interfered with the claims of the Church Established. My brethren, to produce such mighty effects what huge power must be necessary! what an immense ma-

chinery must be brought to bear upon this country! Surely, to judge from the manner in which these things have been spoken of, we might have expected something not less in magnitude than a political earthquake and a religious hurricane combined. If we had heard of an immediate invasion by a foreign army, united with a vastly-extended domestic conspiracy, suddenly detected, the country could not possibly have been put into more alarm; nor would it have been easy to have used more vehement language, to have uttered more determined resolutions of resistance, to have made a greater concentration of power. But now let us ask ourselves, as reasonable men—for surely the hour for reflection must be at length arrived—first, what are these dangers, where they exist, and in what manner they are to be produced—whence they are to flow? And let our first question be, Is it the State or is it the religion of the country that is in danger? In the confusion of ideas which has prevailed for the last few weeks, few have taken any pains to unravel the question, but, as is usual in such cases, they have been mixed up together, and the danger has been considered as universal. The State is considered as having been, in some way or other, attacked in every one of its parts; the Crown is wounded in its prerogative, in its supremacy, in the allegiance due to it, in its claim to the headship of religion in this country; the Constitution, we are told, is menaced by an interference with the spiritual independence of the nation; the Establishment of the Church has been assailed in its supreme rights over conscience, in the universality of its dominion over the spiritual interests of the country, and in that generous toleration which it has vouchsafed to Catholics for the last ten years. And not only so, but the religion, or the Protestantism, of the country, considered as a union of various and most different religious bodies, has been considered as attacked; and Dissenters have not failed to join loudly in the cry which has been raised against our hierarchy by the Church. Now, if it is so, if all this has been done, and if, as I have already observed, it must require some great and mighty power, let us see where that power can be. Let me, therefore, put to you a simple question. Suppose that, six months ago, anybody had told you that it was in the power of the Pope to throw this island into convulsions, to upheave the granite foundations of the British Constitution, to shake the crown of our gracious Sovereign, based, as it is, upon the hearts of all her subjects, upon the affections of none more than of Catholics, to endanger the Church which is fastened by a thousand roots in the very substance of the nation, to bring home into every one's house some imaginary danger of inquisitions, or confessionals, or mysterious agencies, to threaten, in fact to destroy the liberties of the entire country, and that all this it was in the power of him to do by the very breath of his nostrils—oh, if any one had told you this six months ago, you would have laughed him to scorn! The bare imagination that it was in the power of any one, and much more of one who, as a temporal prince, is so small and so much despised in this country, to produce such great and mighty effects on the vast nation of Great Britain! But if in jest or through curiosity you had persisted, and asked of the fanatic who made to you this declaration, by what means, by what instrumentality, by what machinery, the Pope could inflict such grievous injury upon all the interests of the British people, and he had answered, "Oh, by a little scrap of paper in which he will tell the Bishop of Trachis to call himself Bishop of Beverley, and by which he will say that certain divisions of England which are now called districts shall be called dioceses"—oh, you would have turned away from him as little better than an idiot, for presuming to think that such tremendous consequences could come from so simple an act of spiritual jurisdiction. If, then, my brethren, now that all these effects are attributed to this act, you wish to weigh the act, calmly and impartially, I advise you to go back to your feelings of six months ago, and through them to examine well all its possible bearings and consequences, and judge now as you would have judged then; and I presume your conclusions will then be much more reasonable than those which are drawn under the pressure of the present and recent fearful excitement.

But, further, my brethren, if the Pope has this power in his hands, and if he can exercise it, one would suppose that it would be much more powerfully exercised when, for the first time, he sent a bishop into a country where there was not one before, or when he not only sent a bishop, but sent one as a part of his own individuality, as a vicarious self, an *alter ego*, with more than ordinary, with immense extraordinary powers, or even when he doubled the number of such centres of his own individual action. Surely in these cases you would naturally conclude that the Papal power was brought more directly and more immediately to bear upon a country than when he simply changed the denominations or titles of those who already were in that position. Now this is certainly the fact. The Pope has sent bishops into colonies, into Ireland, where there was no bishop before, and yet no one heeded it. He has governed England and Scotland, and some of the dependencies by means of these his vicars apostolic, who were invested with larger powers than bishops in ordinary have, and no one took it to heart. A few years ago he actually doubled the numbers of those vicars in England, and nearly doubled the numbers of those in Scotland, and yet it gave no one the least concern. But now that, instead of these vicars, he has placed bishops, with those more ordinary powers which are exercised in a Catholic country, there is immediately a declaration of war against the measure, as though it were fraught with some great and tremendous consequences that did not exist in the former measures. You have been told again and

again, that the bishops in ordinary have not that same extraordinary power which was possessed by the vicars apostolic; and that the doubling of the number of those vicars a few years ago has had a great effect on the internal development of Catholic action, and on the diffusion of the Catholic faith without our own body, nobody who has attended to our history can for a single moment doubt; nay, I will even go so far as to say, that, taking the question of titles, if a few years ago this question had been put to the body of Protestants in general, "Which would you rather have to rule in England over your Catholic fellow-subjects—they must have bishops of some sort—which would you prefer, the Pope's own vicars, named directly by him, revocable at will by him, and acting merely as his representatives, he being, in fact, the bishop and direct ruler of the country in spirituals, or English bishops, with English sees, and English titles?"—I believe that the latter would have been preferred and selected upon the ground that it would be more domestic, more English, and more native, and, in appearance at least, less connected, in less immediate contact, with that great dread of English Protestantism, the Papacy. Nay, I have it on what I consider very excellent authority, that in 1799 Mr. Pitt proposed to Cardinal Erskine, as a means of diminishing the prejudices of the English against the Catholics, and facilitating concessions to them, that their vicars apostolic should be exchanged for bishops in ordinary.

Then, my brethren, allow me to say, that I cannot consider the strong excitement which has existed as the result of any calm reasoning on the realities of the case. Nay, rather, I find that those who glory the most in the commotion that has occurred, and who extol it as a grand national movement, so far from wishing it to be considered as an act of the nation's reason, rather would have it put before us as a spontaneous and instinctive excitement, an uprising of national antipathies and of national prejudices. They forget, indeed, or they keep from your eyes at least, how perseveringly, how recklessly, they have applied the match to these elements of mischief, and how they have fanned the flame when once it has been raised. But surely it is not right, after this has been boasted of as a mere unreasoning movement, and as carried on without reference to any examination of the law or justice of the case, that it should be now endeavoured to be pronounced to be the rational and reflecting will of the nation? Throughout the whole of this excitement, one most important object of comparison, one most legitimate source of deduction, has been entirely overlooked. People have reasoned and written as though all possibilities connected with this measure could find a place nowhere but in England alone; they seem to have forgotten altogether that there are vast empires and countries in which the Catholic religion prevails, that there are kingdoms in which the Church is watched with the most vigilant eye, and which are as jealous as our own can be of any ecclesiastical or foreign aggression. They forget that there are other countries of a mixed character in which there are large Catholic populations, having their own bishops and clergy. Now, surely it would have been but reasonable to have examined the state of these countries, and inquired if all the fearful results that have been denounced to you have taken place there—whether all has happened that, by any stretch of imagination, could happen here. For instance, you are told—and it is told you in forms the most hateful and the most degrading—that, as a matter of course, these bishops being now established, by some magical process or other unknown, the Inquisition is sure to come into England; how, or where, or by what means, it is impossible to understand. Englishmen with their eyes open are to become necessarily its victims. Why, Spain, and Portugal, and Brazil, and other countries are exclusively Catholic. Is there any Inquisition in them? Certainly not. Austria, Belgium, Bavaria, are mixed countries, in which, however, the Court, the great body of the people, and the Government may be considered greatly Catholic. Is there any Inquisition in them? Certainly not. And, then, will any one pretend to say that England—even supposing that which we seem to dread so much—that England could not guard itself against what is called "Papal Aggression"—against this Inquisition and foreign power—as well as the inhabitants of Spain and Portugal? I say these things, my brethren, not really in earnest, for I should insult your common sense if I put them so, but I put it as a sort of imaginary case, as it is put by them; for I need not tell you that it is only for the purpose of urging you on and deceiving you, or, to use a plain but expressive word, to gull the nation, that these things are represented, and interested persons pretend to fear what they know to be, not remote, but, to use now a more scientific phrase, "too distant even to have a parallax."

But, again, it is said that in the canon law there are declarations completely at variance with allegiance to the Crown and with the civil rights of the people. Well, then, go to Belgium, go to Spain, where that canon law prevails, and ask there if the bishops and clergy quote long passages from the *Decretals*, or the *Extravagantes*, to show that their flocks need not obey their Sovereign; or see whether they are constantly, in speeches and in pamphlets, warning the people, by extracts from the *Corpus Juris*, as it is called, against allegiance to the Pope, because from that it appears that it is incompatible with their civil rights. The least inquiry would show the absolute absurdity of this. And not only so, but it is just as sensible for those who have taken that line as it would be for you, or me, or any one who knows nothing of law, to turn back to the black-letter books and the old statutes of King Stephen, or of Richard the First, and pretend to construe from them the actual state of the law in this realm, without the

slightest knowledge of, or without the least atom of, any subsequent enactments, prescriptions, tacit repeals by desuetude, or usages, or customs.

Again, we are told that there is an oath, that there are certain declarations made by bishops, for instance, which are directly opposed to the oath of allegiance. Well, this oath has been taken for 700 years by every bishop in the whole of Christendom, and perhaps it is even more ancient than that period. It has been taken by bishops under every possible government, from that of the Emperor of Austria to that of the President of the French Republic. Has anybody ever heard, ever dreamt, of sedition in those countries in consequence of that oath?—or is there a single instance on record of a bishop having violated his allegiance and justified himself by that oath?

But, my brethren, I will give you two instances to show you how well, when there is calm reflection upon the subject, the two jurisdictions can be understood to be perfectly separate, and how enlightened Governments and unprejudiced people can allow the two to run on, each in its proper sphere, without the slightest danger of collision. Let the first be that of North America. In the United States, the Pope has this year erected three new archbishops, as he has, every year, for many years back, named four or five, or perhaps more, new bishops, assigning to each of them what has been called "territorial jurisdiction." "Ah," I shall be told, "there is a difference between this country and America; in America there is no dominant or State Church, whose rights are injured." Exactly so; but there is immense jealousy of foreign potentates, of kings and princes interfering with civil liberty, or the rights of subjects, or the temporal concerns of the commonwealth. The question is to be considered more as one of antagonism to a dominant and an Established Church. Then, that is not the question now before us. I only say that when you mention the Established Church you probe the very sore of the whole case. But, apart from this, and looking at the question, as I am engaged in doing now, with reference to aggression on civil or public rights, I ask you again, has it ever been said, has it ever been even whispered, in North America, that there is danger from the Pope thus apportioning new sees, new territories, dividing and subdividing as he thinks best for the good of his Catholic children, or naming new bishops and archbishops, with full jurisdiction in spirituals, in order to carry out fully the organisation of the Catholic Church? And if in that country, which is so watchful over liberty, there is no danger apprehended, what can there be more on this side of the Atlantic, when we have to deal with a firm Government, and with a deeply-rooted monarchy? The other example I will take from nearer home. In Belgium there is, properly speaking, no established or State Church. The majority of the nation is Catholic, the king is Lutheran. When Belgium asserted and secured its independence, everything was in the hands of the Catholics. They were at the head of the Government and of the army; they had full power. But they preferred religious freedom to the golden fetters of the State. They did not declare the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State, but only the religion of the majority. And what is the consequence? The Cardinal Archbishop of Malines, and the other bishops, have no seat whatever in either of the Chambers of the National Legislature; they have no ecclesiastical tribunals, no court of any sort of their own. The Catholic clergy, including the bishops, receive salaries from the State; and so do all others, with this difference, that the Protestant ministers, I believe, have more than the Catholic, because they are married clergy. But the Government has nothing to do with the ecclesiastical arrangements of the country; it does not interfere with the election of bishops, it has no concordat whatever with Rome. The bishops there are exactly in the same position as we are, except that the State recognises them as ministers of religion; but they have no bond to the State, and the State does not pretend to have any supremacy over the Church. Now, while England was at the very height of this late commotion, that is, on the 16th of November last, the Minister of Public Instruction in Belgium, who is charged with the ecclesiastical matters of the Government, Mons. Tesch, thus spoke on occasion of an ecclesiastical question in the Lower House in the Chamber of Representatives of Belgium. "What, for example," he says, "is our present position? On the one hand, the Pope has the right to name in Belgium as many bishops as he thinks proper to create, with as many dioceses as he pleases. What is the right of the Government? That of not paying any more than it considers sufficient for the wants of religion. And so, again, with regard to canons of cathedrals; the ecclesiastical authority can create ten, fifteen, twenty in a diocese, if it please, but, on the other side, the Government preserves its right of not giving salaries to more than it considers necessary for the administration of the diocese." Now, how plain and intelligible that is! The Government has its duties to perform; it performs them, and without reference to those of the Church. If, therefore, the Pope thought it would be better to subdivide Belgium into more dioceses, to erect there an additional archiepiscopal province, he might do so, and the Government would take no notice whatever of the measure. The bishops and archbishops would live as they could; but they would exercise their purely spiritual functions, taking their name from the diocese the Pope gave them

If the State saw that this was useful for the government of the Catholics, that these bishops were really necessary, it would then admit them into the number of its recognised officers, and they would take the appointed salaries; if not, it would leave them alone, to depend upon charity and the love of their flocks for support. And here, where really we do not ask, where we do not expect, one single farthing from the Government or the nation, it is considered a great offence merely to take titles that confer nothing else, because titles are necessary to the organisation of a Catholic hierarchy, and a Catholic hierarchy is an essential part of the constitution of the Catholic Church in any country. How enlightened, how wise, how calm what I have mentioned appears in that neighbouring little State, compared with the ferment and excitement which has been caused amongst us!

But it will be said that in Belgium there exists not the feeling of prejudice which exists in this country against any imaginable action of the Pope; the people of Belgium have not been nurtured for three hundred years in a dread of Papacy and of Popery. And I agree at once that this feeling is probably at the bottom of the whole commotion. But, in the present instance, although some more fanatical persons may have treated the question under its old aspect of being a conflict of the imaginary Antichrist with the Church of this country, the more enlightened opponents of the measure have put it before you in this form, that it is the act of a foreign prince or potentate who intrudes himself thus into the government of the country. Now this, I believe, is nothing but a downright delusion. The law of this country separates completely the Sovereign of the Roman States from the Bishop of Rome. If that had come true which some prognosticated—but which, for my part, I believe to have been utterly impossible—that things should have remained politically in the Eternal City as they were a short time ago, or if out of that chaos of confusion some dictator or superior had sprung up, and the Pope had been circumscribed and restrained to the simple exercise of his ecclesiastical power merely, as Bishop of Rome, our Government would not any longer have recognised him as the Sovereign of the Roman States; and yet had he then issued these apostolic letters, and created this hierarchy, the work would have been just as valid, would have had just the same effect, in every respect as now. And if these apostolic letters had been dated from Gaïeta—as it was a mere chance, I may say, that they were not—instead of Rome, they would have had the same power of constituting a hierarchy, and the hierarchy would have had all the same existence, as now. What, then, are we to say? Why, that it is not the act of a Sovereign, it is not the act of a temporal prince, it is not as supreme governor of Rome and its territories, as having a small Italian dominion, that the Pope has issued this new enactment, but it is as Vicar of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, as the representative of our Lord, as the visible head of the Catholic Church on earth; it is the result of his position as to certain episcopacies, and not a result of his sovereignty.

“Is it possible, then,” I may perhaps be asked, “that all this dreadful excitement and confusion which has taken place respecting us, during the last month, may turn out to have been, after all, nothing more than a mere delusion?” My brethren, if I had to answer this question merely by reference to my estimate of the national character for sobriety, gravity, and reflection, I might hesitate how to answer it; but when, notwithstanding all this, I look back upon our history, and find how similar effects have taken place, and a far larger portion of the nation has been seized with similar alarms to that which has agitated it now, I cannot hesitate to reply, that such is actually the case. There is, my brethren, nothing easier than to excite the public mind, even to a fearful pitch, when all that has the power of working upon it is intent on this object. When clergy, and nobles, and the press, and the bar all devote themselves, with untiring efforts, to impress one single view on the public mind, and couple that with the national prejudice and antipathy, it cannot surprise one that any excess of excitement and passion should be produced. “But,” you will ask, “is it possible that they who have thus the direction of public thought, that persons so elevated by education and position, can themselves have become the victims of delusion?” Look back, my brethren, to that saddest page of England’s history, the conspiracy of Titus Oates, and then tell me if there is anything impossible as the result of public terror and public fanaticism. For there you would see how the whole people was, in a manner, oppressed by a very nightmare of anti-Popery alarm, which destroyed in them not only justice but every sentiment of humanity itself. But, no; not so much the people, for they were the only ones that really withstood the impulse made upon them; but judges, and counsel, and jurors, and they who had to judge and to pronounce upon the law, these were the men who heated the public mind, and increased the public alarm, and produced that dark river of blood that stains and blots that portion of our national annals. And as those were days different from ours, and in which the sacrifice of life was made but light, what were the consequences? That the weak, the innocent, the venerable, and the noble fell before the idol of public terror, and the heart of the generous people seemed to shrink with a panic, so that not a voice was uplifted for the innocent and the helpless. Remember 1780, when, upon the very spot on which we are standing, an immense multitude

was wrought up by its anti-Papal prejudices to go and plunder and destroy Catholic property, and that even for the same reason as this new excitement has been raised, to check, if possible, or to prevent, the enjoyment by Catholics of the same rights as their fellow-subjects. But, to approach topics which come, as it were, nearer home to the feelings and occupations of this nation, is it not too true that the well-known South Sea scheme of the last century, and the railway mania of a few years back, are sufficient to prove to what extent the mind of the nation may be worked up into a flame, till it awakes, as it were, from a dream, to find how immeasurably it has been lowered and injured in the estimation of all surrounding nations?

Now, my brethren, far from considering that I am disparaging the public and national character by conceiving it capable of being worked upon by a wrong indignation, on the contrary, I conceive that by considering that it can be so impelled, in consequence of that towards which its indignation is directed being represented as false and treacherous, and opposed to the public weal, I am thereby saving it rather from the more grievous imputation of stagnant indifference to moral action. This very power which shows a vigour and energy of life, this very power thus directed against that which is placed before it, proves the nation to be so far sound and mighty; so that when its energies shall receive their proper direction, and shall be led to the pursuit of truth, they will afford the fullest assurance of success. The shame and the blame be upon those who have misdirected its energies by misrepresentation. But I believe the return to sound feeling will be only the more complete for the violence with which the well-tempered spring has been bent in the opposite direction.

It may be thought that I have been endeavouring to extenuate to the utmost the importance of the new hierarchy, and to abate its consequences to us, and I may be therefore asked, "What necessity was there, then, for this change?" But I reserve for next Sunday to explain what the hierarchy is; I am treating to-day of what it is not. I have wished to show you that it is no aggression upon the rights of the Crown, or upon the constitution, or upon the Establishment, or upon private individuals. Two months have now elapsed since the apostolic letters—for built there has been none—were issued, and for nearly that period the new bishops have been discharging the duties of their episcopal administration under their new titles. What consequences have issued thence? Have they tithed or tolled in this realm of England? Have they summoned Protestants to obedience? Have they claimed aught of what belongs to the State or to the Established Church? Then were not all these dreadful evils that were seen in this measure of the Pope necessary and immediate results? are they still even prospective? Then, I ask you, as you have waited for two months to see the result, to wait still—wait a few weeks more, a few months more; and then you shall find that what has been foretold by prophets of evil has not come to pass. You shall find that the Catholic Church in this country keeps its even course as it has done.

The best policy with regard to measures like this is that so wisely suggested of old by Gamaliel: "Ye men of Israel, take heed what ye do with these men, refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel be of men it will come to nought, but if it be of God you shall not overthrow it, lest you be found to be fighting against God." If this has been an ecclesiastical work, let time prove it; and you will see whether it be able or not, I do not say to stand, but to do that which it was intended to accomplish. Legislation may come in, as has been suggested, to prevent the Catholic from uttering the names of those who have been given you as bishops, and thus the ears of the zealous shall not be offended by hearing them pronounced, and so it will be shown that the name, and not the thing, it was that was dreaded. But, my brethren, no law can possibly touch the spiritual and organic structure of the Catholic system; it cannot, for any length of time, derange its vital functions. So long as the Catholic who last year obeyed a vicar apostolic because he was a member and subject of his district, now continues to obey a bishop because, though having a different see, he has been transferred by this act of the Pope to his spiritual jurisdiction—so long as this is the case, the essential, the vital, the necessary substance of the hierarchy remains untouched, though it may be penal in him to address his bishop by the title which he holds, even as it was in the time of his fathers before him.

But, as regards ourselves, the work at any rate will have been fairly tried. If we have built a house, the winds have blown, the waves and the floods have beat; if we have built it upon the shifting sands of human wisdom, of course it will be swept away. The trial which we have been undergoing may be well called a fiery one; for passions have been furiously inflamed. If we have built with wood, or hay, or stubble, our work will perish, to our confusion; but if with the more precious materials of God's sanctuary, then it will stand the test. Think not, my brethren, that if I speak thus confidently, I speak contemptuously or stoically. Would to God that it had been in our power, by any sacrifice short of duty, by any suffering on our part, to have spared both ourselves and you the confusions, the disputes, the dissensions, and, still more, the sins and excesses that have taken place in this country during the last few weeks! But if that was not in our power, what was left to us but calmly to endure? For, my brethren, not to have felt the obloquy, the vituperation, the false and calumnious things that have been said concerning us, would have been to be either more or less than man. To have heard one's-self publicly represented as false, as treacherous and untrue, nay, as even steeped in deception, as trained to lies—to have heard one's-self traduced as treacherous, rebellious, a hater of one's

Sovereign—to have been spoken of as though greedy of the dying man's wealth and his children's inheritance, as tamperers with sacred documents and holy books, as instigators of sedition and almost of murder—oh, my brethren, one must have a heart not of flesh not to feel, and deeply to feel, these things! But, while the storm raged and pelted morning and evening, what was our duty but to bow our heads beneath it, or rather, as in holy representations, in sacred imagery, you see the blessed martyr St. Stephen represented as having gathered into the folds of his dalmatic, like to precious gems, the stones with which he had been struck, what was the duty of a Christian bishop but to bear the upheaved indignities with him to the foot of the altar, and there console himself with the thought of Him who suffered calumny, and indignity, and scoffs, and buffets even for our example and for our sakes?

But, my brethren, after all, how soon do these things pass away! How short a time can a smart or a pang afflict us here below! For how brief a space can the evenomed tooth or the poisoned arrow rankle in the flesh! And who, when he comes to stand before thy judgment-seat, O dear Lord Jesus! would wish to bate one atom of what he has humbly endeavoured to bear with patience, conscious at once of its injustice and of his own many offences before God! Oh, and how many consolations have come upon us to compensate fully for anything which we may have suffered! How much true balm has been poured into every wound by the hand of God himself! Never, never more than at this time, my dear brethren—and it will, I am sure, be a consolation to you to know it—never have there been more earnest inquiries after our holy religion, and never have they so fruitfully led to conversion.

To conclude. The ritual for the first approach of a bishop to his diocese exhorts that the streets through which he shall pass be festooned with garlands, and his path strewn with flowers. It is better for us, my brethren, that we have found our way edged with thorns, and our road sown with briars. The episcopal office is a fearful elevation, both in its responsibilities and its duties; and it is well for us, when Divine Providence chooses the height upon which we shall be placed to be upon Calvary rather than upon Thabar. The more deeply and broadly the cross is impressed on any work of ours, the more truly does it come to us sealed of God. Oh, then, do you, my dear Catholic children, lift up your heads in humble hope. In proportion as your lot may be trial and tribulation, look to the powerful protection of your gracious and gentle Sovereign, who must look upon all her grateful subjects alike, for the defence of those civil and religious rights which you have once lawfully acquired. Trust to the justice and uprightness of your fellow-citizens for doing justice at length to your actions, to your intentions, to your thoughts; but look to God alone for that blessing which only can make this hierarchy to your Church a means fruitful of grace, to your souls an instrument of eternal salvation.

CARDINAL WISEMAN AND THE REV. DR. CUMMING.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."

SIR,—At a lecture at the Hanover-rooms on the 7th inst., relating to the oath taken by Roman Archbishops on their receiving the archiepiscopal *pallium*, I remarked:—

"First of all, let me presume that when the Cardinal was made an archbishop he received the *pallium*, before receiving which he repeated a solemn oath which will be found in the *Pontificale Romanum*. I have the book, and have carefully examined all that he must say. It is the edition of Clement VIII., Antwerp edition, 1627. One clause of the oath is as follows: 'Hæreticos schismaticos et rebelles, Domino Nostro, vel successoribus predictis, pro posse persequar et impugnabo.' That is, he solemnly swore on his most solemn oath (I wish thus to prepare you for his reception): 'All heretics (that is Protestants), schismatics (that is members of the Greek Church that separated, as they say, from Rome), and rebels against our Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power.' The correct translation, I believe, of *pro posse*."

On entering the rooms on Wednesday last to give my second lecture, I received a letter from the Cardinal's secretary, inclosing the following communication from Cardinal Wiseman:—

"St. George's, Southwark, Nov. 19.

"SIR,—Dr. Cumming gives an extract from the oath taken by bishops and archbishops, copied from the *Pontifical*, printed at Antwerp in 1627, and states: 'I presume that Cardinal Wiseman, on receiving the *pallium*, took that oath.' To prevent further misunderstanding, I have the Cardinal's permission to state to you, that by a rescript of Pope Pius VII., dated April 12, 1818, the clause quoted by the rev. doctor, and so subject to misunderstanding, is omitted by all bishops and archbishops who are subject to the British Crown.

"The authorised copy now lying before me used by our bishops is headed—

"'Forma Juramenti.

"'Pro Episcopis et Vicariis Apostolicis Episcopali dignitate præditis qui in locis Magnæ Britanniæ subjectione versantur, prescripta a SS. Pio P. VII. die 12 Aprilis, 1818.'

"In the copy of the *Pontifical* kept at the episcopal residence in Golden-square, the copy *perhaps* generally used in consecration of bishops in England, the sentence is cancelled. Dr. Cumming is at liberty to inspect this if he will arrange with me for that purpose."

My allegation was, that every Romish bishop, on receiving the *pallium*, without which he cannot assume the title of archbishop, nor consecrate other bishops—which *pallium* Dr. Wiseman states he received after being appointed Archbishop of Westminster—is required in the *Pontificale Romanum* to swear, among other things, “I will persecute and attack heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Pope.”

Dr. Wiseman sent this message by his secretary just before I began my lecture, as I have already said, informing me that the said persecuting clause “is omitted in the oath taken by all bishops and archbishops subject to the British Crown.” I accepted the invitation; and this day, in company with Sir J. Heron Maxwell and Admiral Vernon Harcourt, I inspected the Cardinal’s *Pontifical* submitted to me at “the episcopal residence, Golden-square.” In the *Pontifical* thus laid before me, I found in the bishop’s oath the very words I quoted, and in bold type, but with a line of black ink drawn over the passage, with a pen apparently very recently used, leaving the words disclaimed by the Cardinal sufficiently legible, but without any initials or other verification of any sort. On the fly-leaf at the beginning of the book I found the same oath in MS., without the persecuting clause, and without initials or other verification, and apparently very recently written. But the startling fact remains. On referring to the oath required to be taken by an archbishop (Dr. Wiseman having been recently made one) on receiving the *pallium*, as given at page 88 (Paris edition, 1664) of the *Pontifical* thus submitted to me by order of the Cardinal, I found the persecuting clause, “*Hæreticos schismaticos et rebelles Domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo*,” printed in a bold type, without any alteration, emendation, or correction whatever, constituting in the Archbishop of Westminster’s own *Pontifical* part and parcel of the oath which every archbishop, on receiving the *pallium*, as I have already stated, must take.

The discovery needs no comment beyond my expression of surprise that the Cardinal should have had the temerity to invite me to inspect his *Pontificale Romanum*.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

November 25.

JOHN CUMMING.

MR. BOWYER’S REPLY TO DR. CUMMING.

“SIR,—Even in controversy with Roman Catholics the rules of courtesy, and an adherence to truth ought to be scrupulously observed.

“You have recently charged Cardinal Wiseman, in various speeches and letters, with having taken an oath containing a promise to persecute heretics, your purpose evidently being to excite the indignation of your hearers, and to make every one of them look upon himself as an object of priestly persecution. You were informed by competent authority that no such oath had been taken, and you were civilly invited to go and inspect the oath that actually was taken. You accepted the invitation, but you cavilled at what you saw, returned incredulous, and publicly intimated that an attempt had been made to deceive you. This insinuation, to say the least of it, was uncharitable; but, if it was untrue, and the case really was as stated to you by the Cardinal’s secretary, it was unpardonable. At all events, you were bound to ascertain what the truth was, which you could have done (as I have done it) by referring to the evidence taken before a committee of the House of Lords in 1825, where the whole matter is circumstantially explained.

“Upon that occasion the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle is asked, ‘Are there more oaths than one, or more engagements than one?’—‘Only one oath, and that oath, as found in the *Pontifical* has been modified by the Pope, at the express desire of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland; for there was one expression in it which seemed to give offence to persons professing a religion different from ours; it was this—*omnes hæreticos persequar et impugnabo*.’ The word ‘*persequar*’ was understood by persons differing from us as if it imposed an obligation upon us by an oath to persecute in the ordinary sense of the word. The meaning which we attributed to it was only to follow up by argument, and to convince, if we could, by proof. However, it was an ambiguous expression, and it was struck out of the oath.’ ‘Is any other oath taken?’—‘There is no other oath taken by a bishop except the ordinary profession of faith which any Christian may take as well as we. There is an oath taken by archbishops on receiving the *pallium* from Rome, but I am not acquainted with the form and substance of it,’ &c. p. 227. Archbishop Murray is asked—‘Is there not an oath taken by an archbishop?’—‘There is.’ ‘Being an archbishop yourself, have you taken that oath?’—‘I have taken the same oath a second time; the same oath which the bishop takes at consecration he also takes on receiving the *pallium*.’—P. 657. ‘Did this oath undergo an alteration about the year 1791?’—‘It underwent an alteration to suit the prejudices of those who mistook the meaning of the oath.’—P. 655.

“This evidence, taken twenty-five years ago, clearly proves that your accusation was groundless, for the oath administered to Irish and to English bishops is the same. And as for your remark, that the oath contained in that part of the Cardinal’s printed *Pontifical* which relates to the reception of the *pallium* by an archbishop is unaltered, you ought to have remembered that there has been no English Catholic archbishop made in England since the Reformation, and that portion of the book has, therefore, never been used at all. And you were told by the Cardinal’s secretary (an eye-witness) that on receiving the *pallium* the Cardinal took no oath whatever—Cardinals being exempt.

“Those who undertake to enlighten the minds of others ought to begin by enlightening their own. Combat the Roman Catholics if you will, but wage war in a spirit of moderation, candour, and truth—like a Christian and a gentleman. It is not by coarse invectives, by perversions of history, and incorrect representations of facts, that we can either of us confute our opponents or do credit to ourselves. Let us, in short, observe ‘the fair humanities’ of controversy, and do as we would be done by.

“I remain, &c.

“GEORGE BOWYER.”

DR. CUMMING'S ANSWER.

SIR,—I have just read your letter in *The Times*, addressed to me, and heartily concur in the sentiment expressed in its opening paragraph, that “in controversy with Roman Catholics the rules of courtesy and adherence to truth ought to be scrupulously observed;” and, having always tried to comply with this duty, I proceed to notice your objections to my account of my visit to the residence of Cardinal Wiseman, as invited through his secretary. You tell me in your letter,

“You have recently charged Cardinal Wiseman, in various speeches and letters, with having taken an oath containing a promise to persecute heretics, your purpose being evidently to excite the indignation of your hearers, and to make every one of them look upon himself as an object of priestly persecution.”

I never confessed to any priest, nor stated to any person on earth, that such was my “purpose.” Cardinal Wiseman lately arrived in England and informed the public that “he governs, and will continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Essex,” &c.; and amazed, in common with nine-tenths of the people of England, at such an announcement, and believing such to be the intention of the Cardinal, I felt it a duty to our common country, thus invaded, to inform its people what would be the nature and the means of this new “government,” by quoting from authentic documents accepted by Dr. Wiseman those promises and oaths which the new governor of these counties has made to his master at Rome. As I make it a rule in this controversy never to repeat hearsay or to quote at second hand, I took my extracts from authorised and indisputable works; and, if the result be that every baptised man in these counties comes to “look upon himself as an object of priestly persecution,” you must blame the Church of your adoption, not the humble individual who merely lets her be seen and heard.

You next instruct me—

“You were informed by competent authority that no such oath had been taken, and you were civilly invited to go and inspect the oath that actually was taken. You accepted the invitation, but you cavilled at what you saw, returned incredulous, and publicly intimated that an attempt had been made to deceive you. This insinuation, to say the least of it, was uncharitable; but, if it was untrue, and the case really was as stated to you by the Cardinal’s secretary, it was unpardonable.”

The “competent authority” was, first, Dr. Doyle, from the pulpit of St. George’s Cathedral, the admirer and eulogist, in the same sermon, of De Castro, who proclaims “the burning of us heretics,” to be “a known, inviolable, and perpetual custom,” and “the ancient opinion of wise Christians; and,” secondly, Cardinal Wiseman, through his secretary, Mr. Searle. The former states an oath is taken by bishops “to combat heresy,” which clause is in no authorised oath in any authorised document whatever; and the latter invites me to “inspect the copy of the *Pontifical* kept at the episcopal residence, Golden-square—the copy, perhaps, generally used in the consecration of bishops in England,” in which, he adds, “the sentence is cancelled;” and in a previous part of the same letter he states, “The clause quoted by the Rev. Doctor, and so subject to misunderstanding, is omitted by the bishops and archbishops who are subject to the British Crown.”

I did accept the invitation. The secretary I found there submitted Dr. Wiseman’s *Pontifical* to my inspection. I examined it carefully, and I found, as I stated in *The Times*, with scarcely a word of comment, a “forma juramenti” on the flyleaf, written with a pen—the clause in question left out; next, the oath administered to bishops, with the said clause legible enough, a pen having been merely drawn over it, with no initials or authorisation; and on turning to page 88, I found the oath to be taken by the archbishop before receiving the *pallium* containing the persecuting clause, un erased and untouched in any respect. My allegation was, “I presume that when the Cardinal was made an archbishop he received the *pallium*, before receiving which he repeated a solemn oath to be found in the *Pontificale Romanum*.” On examining Dr. Wiseman’s *Pontifical*, on the oath taken by an archbishop on receiving the *pallium*, I found the oath just as I described it, and I stated this bare fact in my letter in *The Times*. I was not “incredulous,” for I believed what my eyes read. I did not “cavil,” for I merely pointed out the discovery to my two friends; and next I asked the secretary in attendance to look at it; but he simply reiterated the remark, “I am not a priest—I am not a priest.” I did not “publicly intimate that an attempt had been made to deceive me;” nor did I “insinuate” at all; and therefore your inference of its being “uncharitable,” “untrue,” and “unpardonable,” is simply illogical. You next tell me,—

“At all events, you were bound to ascertain what the truth was, which you could have done (as I have done it) by referring to the evidence taken before a committee of the House of Lords in 1825, where the whole matter is circumstantially explained.”

This is the most important part of your letter. Let me fairly examine it. I must quote your words, though long:—

“Upon that occasion the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle is asked, ‘Are there more oaths than one, or more engagements than one?’—Only one oath; and that oath, as found in the *Pontifical* has been modified by the Pope, at the express desire of the Catholic bishops in Ireland; for there was one expression in it which seemed to give offence to persons professing a religion different from ours; it was this, ‘*omnes hereticos persecuar et impugnabo*.’ The word ‘*persequar*’ was understood, by persons differing from us, as if it imposed an obligation upon us by an oath to persecute in the ordinary sense of the word. The meaning which we attributed to it was only to follow up by argument, and to convince, if we could, by proof. However, it was an ambiguous expression, and it was struck out of the oath.’ ‘Is any other oath taken?’—‘There is no other oath taken by a bishop except the ordinary profession of faith, which any Christian may take as well as we. There is an oath taken by archbishops on receiving the *pallium* from Rome, but I am not acquainted with the form and substance of it,’ &c., p. 227. Archbishop Murray is asked, ‘Is there not an oath taken by an archbishop?’—‘There is.’ ‘Being an archbishop yourself, have you taken that oath?’—‘I have taken the same oath a second time; the same oath which the bishop takes at consecration he also takes on receiving the *pallium*.’—P. 657. ‘Did this oath undergo an alteration about the year 1791?’—‘It underwent an alteration to suit the prejudices of those who mistook the meaning of the oath.’—P. 655.

"This evidence, taken twenty-five years ago, clearly proves that your accusation was groundless, for the oath administered to Irish and to English bishops is the same."

All this and much more than this I was well acquainted with by means of "Phelan's and O'Sullivan's Digest of the Evidence taken before Select Committees of both Houses of Parliament appointed to Inquire into the State of Ireland in 1824-25." But how will you be surprised, my zealous opponent, when I inform you that the interesting evidence you have quoted has no more to do with the Roman Catholic Church in England, which is the subject before us, than with the Roman Catholic Church in Italy or Austria; I might argue with far greater force the persecuting clause is taken by a Romish bishop in England because it is taken by a Romish bishop in Italy, than you do when you say it is not taken in Ireland, therefore it is not taken in England. Let me just show you that "I have done as you say you have done," by presenting you with a document handed in to the Lords' Committee by the Roman Catholic Archbishop Curtis. It is as follows:—

"At an audience of his Holiness held on the 9th day of June, 1791, the archbishops of the kingdom of Ireland have explained to our most holy lord that, through the ignorance and dishonesty (not very courteous) of some persons, certain words found in the form of oath which, according to the Roman ritual, is to be taken by archbishops and bishops, are perverted into a strange sense, and that, in addition to those difficulties which must occur every day in a kingdom where the Roman Catholic religion has not the dominion, they are on this account thrown into new perplexities; whence they humbly beg that, as far as may seem expedient to his Holiness, he would, in his apostolical wisdom, provide some means of delivering them. Accordingly, his Holiness having, at the instance of the undersigned, maturely considered all things, has graciously given indulgence that the Irish archbishops and bishops may use the form of oath which, by the permission of his said Holiness, the Archbishop of Mohilew, in the empire of Russia, has taken."

You will find that this oath, and that in the *Pontifical* are word for word the same, with the exception of a sentence at the end and the omission of the clause in dispute.

This omission is permitted in "a kingdom where the Catholic religion has not the dominion," and of course it is not permitted where it has the dominion, and ceases to be permitted as soon as it attains dominion. Bossuet, quoted by Dr. Delahogue, whose class-book is in use at Maynooth, says, "The Church commands that, as far as possible, the canons be observed. She indulges, in cases of necessity, that they be occasionally relaxed. She tolerates whatsoever she cannot punish without much inconvenience."

You have applied to the English Roman Catholic Church what is exclusively applicable to the Irish, an error for which I hope you will obtain absolution; and I tell you, further, that Dr. Wiseman does not and will not quote what you have quoted as any authority for the English Romish bishops leaving out, as you allege, the persecuting clause. How just is your remark—"Those who undertake to enlighten the minds of others ought to begin by enlightening their own."

You next observe—

"And as for your remark, that the oath contained in that part of the Cardinal's printed *Pontifical* which relates to the reception of the *pallium* by an archbishop is unaltered, you ought to have remembered that there has been no English Catholic Archbishop made in England since the Reformation, and that portion of the book has, therefore, never been used at all."

I stated merely the fact in my letter to *The Times*. I spoke from seeing, not from remembering. It is true, "no English Roman Catholic Archbishop has been made in England since the Reformation," and "that portion of the book, has, therefore, never been used at all." But you will be gratified to find that "that portion of the book" is ready for use, and that the next Romish Archbishop will enjoy the luxury of swearing "*hereticos et schismaticos pro posse persequar et impugnabo.*"

Any private exemptions or special indulgences enjoyed by Dr. Wiseman on the subject of oaths I cannot discuss. No doubt the Cardinal will, by and by, feel it his duty to publish these, as such publication is now imperatively required. Liguori, whose life is written, and whose moral theology is applauded and commended by the Cardinal, enunciates one doctrine, which I should suppose may be found very convenient where "the Roman Catholic religion is not dominant," viz., "However, let oaths be ever so valid, they can be relaxed by the Church."

I may just add, if the clause be good, why beg to be excused taking it in England? if it be bad, why insist on all the bishops of Italy, Austria, Spain, &c., taking it? Meantime if you and your archbishop agree, or get an indulgence to leave out the clause, I engage to show what I have in part done in reply to Dr. Wiseman's manifesto, advertised in this day's *Times*, that were the clause in question left out, the worst part of the oath still remains.

I thank you for your valuable advice—

"Combat the Roman Catholics if you will, but wage war in a spirit of moderation, candour, and truth—like a Christian and a gentleman. It is not by coarse invectives, by perversions of history, and incorrect representations of facts, that we can either of us confute our opponents or do credit to ourselves."—

And merely add my conviction, that you will be much gratified by being informed that I have long ago anticipated it.

I am, your faithful servant,

JOHN CUMMING.

London, Dec. 3.

MR. BOWYER'S REJOINDER.

TO THE REV. DR. CUMMING.

SIR,—I am glad to find that you admit that Roman Catholics should be combated in a spirit of moderation, candour, and truth, worthy of a Christian and a gentleman. Whether your sneers about absolution and indulgences partake of that spirit I will not discuss; but the correctness of your statement that you have anticipated my advice will appear by the following

extract from your second lecture, pp. 12, 13. You quote the passage of Mr. Searle's letter in which he says, "In the copy of the *Pontifical* kept at the episcopal residence at Golden-square, perhaps generally used in the consecration of bishops in England, the passage is cancelled." And then you continue in the following moderate and gentlemanlike terms:—

"Is not this strange? Let me read that to you again. Englishmen are plain matter-of-fact men—honest men—strangers to shuffling, especially to Popish shuffling; and we must have plain matter-of-fact, downright statements. The Cardinal states—

"In the copy of the *Pontifical* kept at the episcopal residence in Golden-square—the copy perhaps (!) generally (!) used in the consecration of bishops in England—the sentence is cancelled."

"Perhaps! Does he not know all about the Romish bishops of England? What a sleepy archbishop not to know what his bishops are doing! What! an archbishop to go and consecrate bishops, and not know whether they have taken the oath or not! What! an archbishop, with a *Pontifical* that he dares not subtract from, that he dares not add to, and whose conditions, if violated, may render his consecration null and void for what I know—who is this archbishop, who does not know whether these things are done or not? *Credat Judæus*. Are there no penances for archbishops?"

"Dr. Cumming is at liberty to inspect this if he will arrange with me for that purpose."

"I'll go there, that I will. I want this clearly settled in your minds; because I will not let Archbishop Wiseman escape with any of his Jesuitical sophistry. [A Voice.—'Go to Golden-square with the police with you.'] No, I will go without police. Did you ever hear of a Scottish Protestant being afraid of anybody? still less of a Romanist."

Mr. Searle spoke of the copy, as you well knew, but you cunningly endeavoured to make your hearers believe that he was speaking of the oath itself; and you exclaimed, "What! an archbishop to go and consecrate bishops, and not know whether they have taken the oath or not!" You concur with me that, "even in controversy with Roman Catholics, rules of courtesy, and adherence to truth, ought to be scrupulously observed." I leave you to determine how the expressions "Popish shuffling," "*Credat Judæus*," and, "Are there no penances for archbishops?" are reconcilable with courtesy, and whether your construction of the words "the copy, perhaps," is in accordance with truth.

And when you heroically said, "I'll go there, that I will, because I will not let Archbishop Wiseman escape with any of his Jesuitical sophistry," and you manfully rejected the suggested protection of the police, because no one ever heard of a Scottish Protestant being afraid of any one, much less of a Romanist, did it ever occur to you that you had been invited to the house of a gentleman, a prelate, a prince of the Roman Church, and not to a den of thieves or swindlers? Is this your notion of courtesy?

But you say in your letter to me, "I did not publicly intimate that an attempt had been made to deceive me." Did you not? Then what did you mean by saying in the letter to *The Times* appended to your second lecture, that the MS. oath on the fly-leaf of the Cardinal's *Pontifical* "appeared to have been very recently written," and that the erasures of the supposed persecuting clause in the book were made by a pen apparently very recently used? You either meant nothing, or you meant that this book had been tampered with. But the man who wrote that form on the fly-leaf, and made the erasures, nearly thirty years ago, is now living, and can prove the groundlessness of your charge.

Let me further call your attention to the following passage in that same letter, where you say,—

"My allegation was, that every Romish bishop, on receiving the *pallium*, without which he cannot assume the title of archbishop, nor consecrate other bishops—which *pallium* Dr. Wiseman states he received after being appointed Archbishop of Westminster—is required in the *Pontificale Romanum* to swear, among other things, 'I will persecute and attack heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Pope.'"

And you made this allegation, being perfectly aware, as you admit in your letter to me, that ever since the year 1791 the Irish bishops and archbishops have not taken the oath with that clause! You alleged that every Romish bishop takes that particular oath on receiving the *pallium*, though you knew that no Irish archbishop has done so since the year 1791! Is this fair and consistent with your profession? It is also remarkable that in the letter above referred to (reprinted with your second lecture), you suppress all notice of Mr. Searle's statement, that the Cardinal took no oath whatever when he received the *pallium*—Cardinals being exempt.

But, after all, the issue lies in a nutshell. Did the Cardinal, or did he not, take the oath with the supposed persecuting clause?

You were told by the Cardinal, through his secretary, that he took no oath on receiving the *pallium*, and that he never took the oath with the obnoxious clause. He referred you to the authority by which it was omitted, viz., a rescript of Pius VII., dated the 2nd of April, 1818. This is corroborated by the evidence of the Irish prelate in 1825, proving that the clause in question has been abolished in another part of the United Kingdom ever since 1791. You saw at Golden-square the form of oath taken by English Roman Catholic bishops, which does not include that clause. And you learn by the evidence of Archbishop Murray that an archbishop takes the same oath as a bishop. If all this does not convince you;

if you will not even give that credit to the assertions of the Cardinal and his secretary which is due to every gentleman asserting a matter-of-fact within his own knowledge; if you are determined to see fraud everywhere, and to cavil at all that is said to you, any appeal to your candour must be vain, and I can only leave the public to determine whether you have succeeded in proving the charge which you have so publicly preferred. I remain, Sir, yours, &c.,
Temple, December 4th. GEORGE BOWYER.

THE BISHOPS.

The following is a copy of an address from the archbishops and bishops (except Exeter and St. David's) to her Majesty:—

“ TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“ The humble Address of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England.

“ MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, the archbishops and undersigned bishops of the Church of England, approach your Majesty with sentiments of veneration and loyalty at a time when an unwarrantable insult has been offered to the Church and to your Majesty, to whom appertains the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil. This our country, whose Church being a true branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments are duly ministered according to Christ's ordinances, is treated by the Bishop of Rome as having been a heathen land, and is congratulated on its restoration, after an interval of three hundred years, to a place among the Churches of Christendom. The return of our people is anticipated to a communion the errors and corruptions of which they deliberately renounced, and which continues to maintain practices repugnant to God's word, inculcates blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, and prescribes as necessary to salvation the belief of doctrines grounded on no warranty of Scripture.

“ It is part of the same arrogant assumption that, in defiance of the law which declares that ‘ no foreign prelate or potentate shall use and exercise any manner of power, authority, or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm,’ the Bishop of Rome has pretended to exercise spiritual dominion over the people of this country; and in nominating certain Romish ecclesiastics to particular places or sees in England, has re-asserted his claim of supremacy over the kingdom, and has interfered with a prerogative constitutionally belonging to your Majesty alone.

“ We consider it our duty to record our united protest against this attempt to subject our people to a spiritual tyranny from which they were freed at the Reformation; and we make our humble petition to your Majesty to discountenance by all constitutional means the claims and usurpations of the Church of Rome, by which religious divisions are fostered, and the labour of our clergy impeded in their endeavours to diffuse the light of true religion amongst the people committed to their charge.

CONTENTS.

THE “ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.”

FIRST SERIES.—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the two Letters to the “Times” by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the “New Batch of Bishops,” from the “Weekly Dispatch;” two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's “Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;” concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES.—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 2, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, Nov. 7, 1850.

THIRD SERIES.—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the “Vatican Masquerade.”

FOURTH SERIES.—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland (an original article), by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the “Queen and the Pope.”

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and Leading Articles from the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note by the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of “Catholicus;” Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

SEVENTH SERIES.—Leading Articles on Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto, from the Daily and Weekly Press; also Letters and Replies from the Bishops of the Established Church.

EIGHTH SERIES.—Letter from Joseph Hume, Esq., M.P.; Fourteen Letters from Bishops of the Established Church; Dr. Doyle's Sermon, Nov. 17th; Catholic Bishop of Newport's Pastoral; and a Letter from a Correspondent.

NINTH SERIES.—Mr. Roebuck's Letter to Lord John Russell; the Rev. Mr. Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell; and Letter from Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., M.P., to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The ELEVENTH SERIES will contain some very important documents.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series; or, Postage Free, Threepence.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

ADDRESSES TO THE CROWN;
RESIGNATION OF MR. BENNETT, OF ST. PAUL'S,
KNIGHTSBRIDGE; AND
THE PROTESTANT AGITATION, BY "CAROLUS."
LORD BEAUMONT'S LETTER TO THE EARL OF ZETLAND.

ADDRESSES TO THE CROWN.

(*From the "Times."*)

The City of London, the University of Oxford, and the University of Cambridge, on December 10th, laid before their Sovereign the expression of their indignation at the endeavour by the Bishop of Rome to exercise a power which the realm of England has almost ignored.

The Lord Mayor and officers of the corporation assembled at Guildhall at half-past 8 o'clock, and proceeded thence, at 9 o'clock, to the Great Western Railway station, Paddington, which they left for Slough soon after 10 o'clock.

On the members of the corporation arriving at Slough they drew lots for the carriages waiting there to convey them to and from Windsor, and, the procession having been formed, proceeded in due order to Windsor, arriving there by a quarter before 12 o'clock.

The procession from Slough to Windsor was formed in the following order:—

Police-constables on foot, four abreast.

The Commissioner of Police.

Lord Mayor's footmen in state liveries.

Officers of the Lord Mayor's household in carriages.

Senior City Marshal on horseback.

The Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, in his carriage, drawn by six horses, attended by the Swordbearer, Common Crier, and Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Vivian.

His Lordship's Beadle on foot, in his gown, bearing his mace.

The Aldermen past the chair, in their carriages, each attended by his beadle on foot, in his gown, bearing his mace.

The Recorder in his carriage.

The Aldermen below the chair in their carriages, each attended by his Beadle as above.

The Sheriffs in their state-carriages, accompanied by their Chaplains.

The principal officers in their carriages.

The Junior City Marshal on horseback.

The Mover and Seconder of the Address, in their carriage.

The other members of the Corporation, in their carriages.

Police-constables on foot, four abreast.

The procession was flanked by mounted police.

The Great Western Railway Company placed at the disposal of the corporation the railway carriage hitherto used by her Majesty. The company took down seventy private carriages and two hundred horses for the accommodation of those who went by the special train.

A body of the City police were in attendance along the route from the Guildhall to the Paddington station, and a larger body were in waiting at Slough, to conduct them to Windsor.

Special trains were also engaged for the members of Oxford and Cambridge, and at twelve o'clock, in spite of the cold, foggy day, nearly all the inhabitants of Windsor had turned out into the streets, to gaze upon the variegated crowd of aldermen, town-councillors, doctors and bachelors of divinity, masters of arts, and graduates in the various faculties, who filled the streets. The corporation moved comfortably along in vehicles of various descriptions, from the gorgeous carriages of the mayors and sheriffs to the occasional fly pressed into service at the railway station. The Universities humbly marched on foot—two and two; heads of houses, proctors, bedells, fellows and tutors, doctors, masters, and bachelors, truded along over the soft damp clay from the Town-hall to the Palace through files of people, who stood silently looking on. The effect of the scene was solemn. In the Town-hall all was bustle and confusion; fellows looking for lost colleges, doctors on the look-out for missing robes and hoods, masters in doubt as to whether a hat or a cap was "the thing" for a deputation—a

general toilette of band, tie, gown, and hood, more remarkable for haste than elegance; then a ceremonious gathering of dignitaries by an official after the order of their graduations, at which every one smiled, and which every one neglected, except the few stately heads of houses, and a decorous filing down stairs into the streets, where the order of the procession was soon rendered almost invisible by a thick dark cloud of vapour which clung over hood, and gown, and band, till they hung down in limp folds. But still the effect was the more solemn. There was a silence among the people and in the ranks of the learned army who were moving on so regularly, which was more stirring than even the cheers of an excited multitude. From the hall to the palace a number of police were drawn up to keep order, but there was no occasion for their services. As the sable mass moved slowly on, relieved in its uniformity here and there by purple and scarlet gowns, or white or purple hoods and bachelors' sheepskins, the people now and then uttered a few cries in a subdued tone against the recent bull of Rome, but their general demeanour was tranquil and orderly. When the procession arrived at the Castle, the fog, lifting a little, discovered a body of the Guards drawn up in honour of the occasion, and the royal standard was visible from one of the turrets flagging lazily in the air. Pouring through the gates into the courtyard, the mingled procession of corporators and universitymen passed on to the entrance, through a guard of honour drawn up to receive them, and were soon, to the annoyance of some of the exclusives of the body, mixed together in the hall. The corporation had the advantage of a good bright rallying colour, however, and soon extricated their bright robes from the dark colours of the Universities.

The corporation, having formed in one of the large reception-rooms to the right of the staircase, had the honour of being first introduced to her Majesty, who was seated at the end of St. George's Hall, with her Court around her. Among those on the right of the throne were Lord John Russell, Sir G. Grey, the Marquis of Westminster, Lord Marcus Hill, the Marquis of Anglesey; the Ladies in Waiting and two pages of honour stood on the left, and his Royal Highness Prince Albert received the addresses, and presented them to her Majesty. The sides of the hall near the throne were lined with the gentlemen of the Queen's body-guard in full uniform, and all the Ministers were in the Windsor or other official uniform. Her Majesty was dressed in simple mourning. The corporation, having advanced to the royal presence, drew up, and the Right Hon. J. S. Wortley, the Recorder, then read, in audible tones, the following address:—

“ TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“ The humble Address of the Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London.

“ MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,—We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, humbly approach your Majesty on no ordinary occasion.

“ Deeply grateful to Almighty God for His many blessings bestowed upon this highly-favoured nation, we acknowledge amongst the chief the restoration of the Protestant faith by the Reformation, and the national vindication of those great principles of civil and religious liberty, for the defence and maintenance of which your illustrious house was called to the throne of these realms.

“ We learn with feelings of surprise and indignation that the Bishop of Rome has recently issued a bull, whereby he not only presumes to partition this country into pretended dioceses of the Church of Rome, but at the same time assumes the right of appointing archbishops and bishops of such dioceses, and conferring upon them territorial titles and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all which we deem to be inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution in Church and State, an invasion of your Majesty's royal supremacy, an audacious usurpation of your Majesty's prerogative of alone bestowing titles of honour, and a grievous insult to this Protestant nation.

“ For remedy whereof we earnestly entreat that your Majesty will direct such measures to be taken as in your royal wisdom shall seem expedient, assuring your Majesty that you may ever confidently rely on the affectionate and cordial support of a loyal, united, and religious people.

“ We further humbly acquaint your Majesty that we view with feelings of deep anxiety and alarm the introduction of late years of many Romish principles and practices, and the unauthorised revival of many obsolete forms in the worship and ministrations of our reformed national Church by some clergymen in this and other dioceses, and we humbly express our firm conviction that great encouragement has been thereby given to that act of usurpation and aggression against which we now protest, while it is our belief that greater danger to the Protestant Church is to be apprehended from unfaithful teaching than from open hostility.

“ We pray that it may please Him by whom kings reign and princes decree judgment long to preserve your Majesty to be the defender of the Protestant faith against every assault from without and every desertion from within, and that under your Majesty's gentle and benignant sway peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established in these realms.

“ By order of the Court,

“ HENRY ALWORTH MEREWETHER.”

Her Majesty listened with great attention to this address, and at several portions of it slightly inclined her head, as if in token of assent; and, when it had been presented to her, and had been handed by her to Sir G. Grey, read in a clear, sweet voice the following "most gracious answer," every word of which was caught up with the greatest eagerness:—

"I receive with much satisfaction your loyal and affectionate address.

"I heartily concur with you in your grateful acknowledgments of the many blessings conferred upon this highly favoured nation, and in your attachment to the Protestant faith and to the great principles of civil and religious liberty, in the defence of which the City of London has ever been conspicuous.

"That faith and those principles are so justly dear to the people of this country that I confidently rely on their cordial support in upholding and maintaining them against any danger with which they may be threatened, from whatever quarter it may proceed."

When the reply had been handed to the corporation, Sir P. Laurie, the mover, and Alderman Farebrother, the seconder of the address, had the honour of being presented to her Majesty by the Lord Mayor, after which the deputation retired.

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL.

The deputation from the Court of Common Council, headed by Mr. John Wood and Mr. W. Blake, were next introduced, and their address was also read by the Recorder, as follows:—

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"The humble and dutiful Address of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

"MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,—We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled, approach your Majesty with renewed assurances of our unalterable attachment to your Majesty's person and throne, and to the constitution, by which the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover is secured.

"Among the highest blessings for which, under Divine Providence, we are grateful to your Majesty's benign government, we acknowledge the establishment of religious liberty and the preservation of the pure and scriptural worship of the Protestant faith, free from all foreign dominion or interference. We have seen, therefore, with astonishment and indignation the recent publication in this country of a bull, or instrument, obtained from the Bishop of Rome, which purports to parcel out this land into pretended dioceses dependant on that see, and has been followed by the assumption under it of titles and powers inconsistent with the rights of your Majesty's Crown and the liberties of your people, at variance with the spirit of our laws, and ignoring the very existence of the Protestant religion within these realms.

"Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the corporation of the City of London, have ever been foremost in advocating and promoting the admission of every class of their fellow-subjects, including Roman Catholics, to the equal enjoyment of civil rights, without reference to religious distinctions. We hope, therefore, that our present course cannot be attributed to any desire to restrict religious freedom, while we humbly but confidently assure your Majesty that you may rely on the affectionate and loyal support of the citizens of London in repelling the encroachments now attempted by the servants of a foreign potentate and ecclesiastic, who assumes to govern and enthrall your Majesty's subjects by usurping the royal powers and prerogative, and pretending to establish independent jurisdictions within your Majesty's dominions.

"We are further reluctantly impelled to represent to your Majesty that we have from time to time witnessed with deep regret the gradual introduction of unauthorised innovations in the scriptural worship and ministrations of the Protestant Church of England, and the occasional inculcation by some of her clergy of principles and practices nearly allied to those of Rome, which, by exalting the power of the priesthood in derogation of your Majesty's supremacy as its head, and by reviving forms and ceremonies long disused in the Church, with the general acquiescence of its rulers, have bred unseemly dissensions in the bosom of the Establishment itself, and given, as we believe, great encouragement to the enemies of the reformed religion.

"At this juncture we rely with the fullest confidence upon your Majesty, assisted by your Majesty's constitutional advisers, and aided, if necessary, by the wisdom and authority of Parliament, to enforce the laws and devise means sufficient to vindicate the rights of the Crown, to resist this attempted invasion of our liberties by the See of Rome, and to maintain the purity and integrity of the Protestant faith and worship.

"It is our fervent prayer that your Majesty's life may be long spared, and that your Majesty and your Majesty's descendants may continue happy instruments, under God, in securing the inestimable blessings of liberty of person and freedom of conscience to a free, enlightened, and religious people.

"By order of Court,

"HENRY ALWORTH MEREWETHER."

Her Majesty was graciously pleased to give the following reply:—

"I sincerely thank you for your renewed assurances of unaltered attachment to my person and throne, and to the constitution of this country.

"Your tried and consistent advocacy of the equal enjoyment of civil rights by all classes of your fellow-subjects entitles the expression of your sentiments on the present occasion to peculiar consideration.

"You may be assured of my earnest desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the religious liberty which is justly prized by the people of this country, and to uphold, as its surest safeguard, the pure and scriptural worship of the Protestant faith, which has long been happily established in this land."

The deputation then retired, after the usual ceremonials, and

THE CITY LIEUTENANCY.

were introduced, in all the honours of their full uniform, and presented the following address:—

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"The humble Address of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and the rest of your Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London,

"MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,—We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and the rest of your Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London, humbly desire to renew the assurance of our devoted loyalty and affection to your Majesty's person and government.

"We have witnessed with the greatest surprise and indignation the late unwarrantable aggression of the Bishop of Rome against the undoubted prerogative of your Majesty's Crown, and the liberties of the people, by the promulgation of a bull, or instrument, in which a foreign potentate arrogantly assumes to himself the power to introduce into this kingdom a Romish hierarchy, and to confer upon them territorial rank and jurisdiction.

"We therefore humbly, but earnestly, pray that your Majesty will be pleased to adopt such measures as in your Majesty's wisdom may appear to be best calculated to vindicate your Majesty's supremacy as by law established, and to prevent all further encroachments and attempts at usurpation by the See of Rome upon the liberties and consciences of the people of this Protestant kingdom; and, if the law be insufficient, that your Majesty will be pleased, with the aid of your Parliament, to make such further enactments as may be found adequate to the present emergency.

"By order of the Court,

"HENLEY SMITH, Clerk and Treasurer."

To which address her Majesty was pleased to return the following most gracious answer:—

"Your renewed assurances on the present occasion of devoted loyalty and affection to my person and government is highly gratifying to me.

"It will continue to be, as it has ever been, my earnest endeavour, in the exercise of the power and authority intrusted to me, as the supreme governor of this realm, to maintain the independence and uphold the constitutional liberties of my people against all aggression and encroachment."

The City Lieutenants then retired, and joined their corporate brethren in the Waterloo-hall, where a substantial luncheon was prepared for them. While these proceedings were taking place the members of the Universities were assembled in two separate reception-rooms on the left of the staircase. The Duke of Wellington was an object of attraction common to them both, and Cambridge flocked freely into the Oxford room to gaze on his Grace, who was seated by himself at one side of the apartment, in the full dress of Chancellor of Oxford, while by him stood Sir Harry Inglis and the authorities of the University, whom their juniors irreverently denominated the "Dons." His Grace looked remarkably well, and at times said a few words to Sir H. Inglis and his friends around him. After the corporation had retired, the members of the University of Oxford had the honour of being introduced to her Majesty. His Grace the Chancellor, having then advanced to the foot of the throne, read in his peculiar, energetic manner, with great vigour and animation, the following address, to which her Majesty listened in an expressive and dignified attitude of attention:—

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your Majesty's most dutiful subjects, the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, beg leave to approach your Majesty with the renewed assurance of our attachment to your Majesty's royal person, our loyalty to your Crown, and our steadfast adherence to the principles which called the house of Brunswick to the British throne.

"Recognising your Majesty as, under God, 'the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all your Majesty's other dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal,' we have witnessed with indignation the recent publication within

this realm of a Papal instrument purporting to constitute in your Majesty's dominions a new territorial hierarchy, subject to the Bishop of Rome.

"We humbly desire to lay before your Majesty our earnest remonstrance against this assumption of authority by the Bishop of Rome, in open invasion of your Majesty's royal prerogative, and in derogation of the honour and sovereignty of the British Crown.

"We also beg solemnly to protest against the intrusion, by the same foreign and pretended authority, of bishops claiming ordinary spiritual jurisdiction over or within the dioceses of England, not only in manifest violation of the rights and independence of the Church of England, but in virtual denial of her existence as a true and living branch of the Catholic Church of Christ.

"We further humbly crave permission to profess before your Majesty our faithful adherence to the principles, doctrine, and discipline of our Reformed Church, our cordial assent to her declaration that 'no foreign prince or prelate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within your Majesty's dominions,' and our firm resolution to resist the corrupt doctrines and superstitious practices of the Church of Rome, or any attempt to revive the Papal usurpations over the clergy and laity of the Protestant Church of England.

"While, therefore, we disclaim the wish to debar your Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, or any others, from the free exercise of their religion, we nevertheless venture, with all humility, to pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take such measures as to your Majesty may seem meet to repress all aggressions and encroachments of any foreign ecclesiastical Power upon the rights of your Crown or the independence of your people.

"Finally, we beg leave humbly to assure your Majesty that it will be ever our earnest endeavour, as it is our bounden duty, to train up the youth intrusted to our care in the principles of loyalty and affection toward your Majesty, and in faithful attachment to the truths of Holy Scripture, as set forth in the articles and formularies of our Reformed Church; and it is our fervent prayer that it may please Almighty God to pour down upon your Majesty the riches of his grace, and to bless your people with the long continuance of your Majesty's happy reign.

"Given at our House of Convocation, under our common seal, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1850."

The address, having been presented to her Majesty, was handed by her to Sir George Grey. Lord John Russell, who had been standing to the left of the throne, as if deeply interested in the contents of the document, scrutinised the faces of the deputation very keenly as her Majesty returned the following gracious reply:—

"I accept with much satisfaction the renewed proof afforded by your address of your attachment and loyalty to my person and Government, and of your steadfast adherence to the principles of the constitution.

"It has ever been, and will ever continue to be, my endeavour to promote the efficiency and maintain the purity of our Reformed Church, the supreme government of which, under God, is by law confided to me; and it is highly gratifying to me to be assured of your faithful adherence to its principles, doctrine, and discipline.

"While I cordially concur in the wish that all classes of my subjects should enjoy the free exercise of their religion, you may rely on my determination to uphold alike the rights of my Crown and the independence of my people against all aggressions and encroachments of any foreign Power.

"Your earnest endeavour, in the discharge of your important duties, to train up the youth intrusted to your care in faithful attachment to the truths of Holy Scripture cannot fail, under God's blessing, to have a powerful effect in strengthening the defences of our Protestant faith, and in preserving inviolate the privileges which are justly dear to the people of this country."

His Grace the Chancellor then presented several of the Heads of Colleges and Halls, who had the honour of kissing hands, after which the deputation retired to the Waterloo-hall.

The deputation from Cambridge was next introduced. After a short delay in the Armoury-room outside St. George's-hall, during which the younger members were rendered rather impatient by the sight of the corporators defiling from luncheon, and by the rumour that the sister University, being too late in assembling, had unduly delayed them, Prince Albert, in the robes of Chancellor of Cambridge, came from the hall, and received the deputation with much courtesy, conversing for a few moments with several of the gentlemen with whom he was acquainted. The deputation then advanced, headed by his Royal Highness.

Having arrived at the foot of the throne, his Royal Highness read the address with great clearness and well-marked emphasis, as follows:—

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"The humble Address of the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,—We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the

Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge, humbly beg leave to approach the throne, to express to your Majesty our grateful acknowledgments of that security as regards our persons, and that preservation of our religion, with which it has pleased God to bless our country under the rule of your Majesty's royal house.

"It has hitherto been our great privilege to regard the realm of England as possessing, under our supreme governor, an entire power and jurisdiction both in Church and State, independent of all foreign interference whatsoever; and every attempt at such interference has accordingly been met by strenuous and effectual resistance on the part of your Majesty's royal predecessors.

"At the Reformation in particular, and subsequently, this fundamental principle was, by the patriotic care of our Sovereigns, asserted and ratified by various acts of the Legislature; an oath is, moreover, exacted of officers of state, of ministers of the Established Church, of masters and fellows of colleges, and of all persons taking degrees within the Universities, declaratory of their rejection of all foreign jurisdiction, power, and authority, as well ecclesiastical or spiritual as civil, within this realm.

"We therefore most humbly beg leave to represent unto your Majesty that it is with deep concern that we have learned that the Bishop of Rome has arrogated to himself the right to intermeddle with the government of our country, and to ignore the ancient episcopacy of our Church by presuming to confer on certain of your Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion the highest ecclesiastical titles, derived from English towns, together with territorial jurisdiction.

"By this unwarrantable assumption of power on the part of the Bishop of Rome, not only are your Majesty's high prerogative and the lawful authority and jurisdiction of the prelates of our Church invaded and outraged, but the consciences of your Majesty's loyal subjects grievously offended.

"We therefore humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct such measures to be taken as this infraction if not of the letter yet of the spirit of our laws seems to demand, and thus secure to your Majesty's devoted and affectionate people the full possession of their ancient rights and liberties.

"In the meanwhile our most earnest desire is that Almighty God may long preserve your Majesty to reign in peace over a loyal and contented people."

The Queen having received the address from Prince Albert, and having given it into the custody of the Secretary of State, proceeded to read the following reply, which was most anxiously listened to. Her Majesty read it with great deliberation, and with decided accents:—

"I thank you for your loyal and dutiful address.

"I fully participate in your expression of gratitude to Almighty God for the blessings which He has been pleased to bestow upon this country, and I rejoice in the proofs which have been given of the zealous and undiminished attachment of the English people to the principles asserted at the Reformation.

"While it is my earnest wish that complete freedom of conscience should be enjoyed by all classes of my subjects, it is my constant aim to uphold the just privileges and extend the usefulness of the Church established by law in this country, and to secure to my people the full possession of their ancient rights and liberties."^a

The deputation then retired to the Waterloo-hall, and, while partaking of the luncheon, discussed very freely the meaning of the reply. It was generally remarked that her Majesty looked very well, though somewhat flushed; and various opinions were passed with respect to the demeanour of Lord John Russell, who had stood with his finger on his lips and with downcast head during the greater part of the time that was occupied by the address and reply. In the critical disposition which the occasion evoked it did not escape some good-humoured comment that in the magnificent hall in which the luncheon was spread the portrait of a Cardinal (Gonsalvi) ornamented one extremity, and the portrait of a Pope (Pius VII.) the other, and seemed to smile benignantly on the royal deputations. The portraits had been placed there when the Waterloo-hall was first decorated. About two o'clock all the members of the deputations had taken their leave, and the Castle resumed its ordinary quiet aspect.

The impressions of the press on these replies are as various as the papers that print them. The *Times* thinks:—

"Upon the whole, every candid person must admit that her Majesty has spoken with dignity, firmness, and propriety, and has addressed to a portion of the clergy of the Church of England a lesson which they greatly needed, and by which they will do wisely to profit."

The *Chronicle* thinks them "most satisfactory," for—

"However irritating may have been some of the expressions in which the ultra-Protestant zeal of some portion of the community has found vent, the Roman Catholic body will be reassured by the determination of the Sovereign to maintain 'the principles of civil and religious liberty, in the defence of which,' it is appositely remarked, 'the City of London has ever been conspicuous.'"

Her Majesty, at the same time, declaring her attachment to the Protestant establishment. The *Chronicle*, however, makes one exception:—

"The only passage into which the Premier has succeeded in introducing objectionable phraseology is that portion of her Majesty's answer to the Oxford address, in which she has been advised to refer to 'our Reformed Church, the supreme government of which under God is by law confided to me'—a position which is erroneous, so far as the legal supremacy of the Crown, in all causes concerning all subjects of the realm, is confused with a spiritual control over the English Church."

The *Morning Herald* is in despair:—

"It is with the deepest regret that we find ourselves compelled to be the vehicle, this morning, of conveying to the loyal subjects of her Majesty tidings which, while the Queen's own name and her own words are apparently involved in them, will render every Protestant heart in her dominions sorrowful for the present, and full of apprehension for the future. The Queen has received the Corporation of London—has replied to the loyal address of both Courts, and has so in terms which render it but too plain that the Administration, up to the present point at least, has been unable to come to a resolution to do anything! The replies contain nothing—absolutely nothing!"

The *Daily News*, on the contrary, is quite satisfied:—

"For, though the royal replies are of Ministerial preparation, they manifest that sense of the national independence and of faithful Protestantism which has found universal voice throughout the country, and indicate an accord between the people and the Sovereign that must result in something more than words and enthusiasm."

RESIGNATION OF MR. BENNETT, OF ST. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE.

The following important correspondence has been forwarded to us for publication:—

"St. Barnabas', Pimlico, Dec. 4, 1850.

"MY LORD,—On reviewing the correspondence which has been carried on between your lordship and myself since July 1, I find that in my letter to you, dated July 15, I wrote as follows:—

"On the one hand, as I hope it will be clearly understood that, conscientiously, I cannot forego any of the principles which in this letter I set forth and advocate, and if I remain in the cure of souls, by those principles I must be permitted to abide; so, on the other hand, as I consider myself morally and spiritually bound not to oppose your lordship in those matters which, as diocesan, you have a right and a duty to regulate, I am ready to withdraw from a position in which the possibility of such an event might arise."

"And again in my letter of October 30, I wrote as follows:—

"My conclusion is in this difficulty, as it was in my previous letter of July 15, that I ought, if called upon, to resign my living. . . . I would, then, put it to your lordship in this way: If your lordship should be of continued opinion, seeing me and knowing me as now you do, that I am guilty of unfaithfulness to the Church of England, and if your lordship will upon that signify your judgment as bishop that it would be for the peace and better ordering of that portion of the Church which is under your episcopal charge that I should no longer serve in the living of St. Paul's, I will then the very next day send you my resignation."

"I have now to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's letter, dated November 27, in which you say:—

"Upon the whole, if you are not prepared to comply *simpliciter* and *ex animo*, with the requisition contained in my letter of the 16th inst., I must call upon you to fulfil your offer of retiring from a charge which I deliberately think you could not in that case continue to hold without great injury to the Church."

"My lord, seeing that I am unable conscientiously to place myself under the former clause of this sentence, *i. e.* to 'comply *simpliciter* and *ex animo* with your requisition of the 16th inst.,' it follows that I must submit to the 'call' made upon me in the latter.

"But this 'call' refers to an 'offer' made by me in my letter of October 30.

"I conclude, therefore, that in making this call upon me you wish to express all that was involved or contained in that offer, namely, that you are 'of continued opinion that I am guilty of unfaithfulness to the Church of England,' and that you therein 'signify your judgment as bishop that it is for the peace and better ordering of that portion of the Church which is under your episcopal charge that I should no longer serve in the living of St. Paul's.'"

"To this judgment of my bishop deliberately given, and the call thereupon deliberately made, I consider it to be my duty to submit.

"Accordingly, I now redeem the pledge given in my letter of October 30; and in answer to your 'call' now made upon me, I hereby send you my resignation of the perpetual curacy of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

"The precise time when I shall cease to have further charge of the parish, and the future arrangements necessary for the performance of the various services of the church, perhaps

your lordship will have the kindness to arrange with the churchwardens, whom I will desire to wait upon you as soon as possible for that purpose.

"In concluding this correspondence, as I feel that in all probability I may have made use of expressions or brought forward arguments which may have given offence to your lordship personally, I desire for all such occasions of offence to express my sincere regret, and to assure your lordship that they have been purely inadvertent.

"For any offence so inadvertent I hope I may safely ask your lordship's charity and forgiveness; and remain

"Your lordship's faithful servant,
"W. S. E. BENNETT.

"The Lord Bishop of London."

"Fulham, Dec. 9.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, in which you tender your resignation of the perpetual curacy of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. That resignation, under the circumstances of the case, I think I am bound to accept; and in doing so I deem it right briefly to recapitulate those circumstances.

"During the last four years I have several times cautioned you on the subject of the excessive ritualism which you were inclined to practise, as approaching too nearly to that of the Church of Rome. Writing to you on the 7th of January, 1847, on the subject of intoning the prayers, I said, 'I really fear you are carrying things too far.' This caution referred, as I afterwards explained it, not so much to any deviations from the rubric, as to 'certain peculiarities of manner, which are not necessary to a correct observance of the rubric, and which afford a handle to objectors.'

"In February, 1849, I received a letter from one of your parishioners, complaining of certain peculiarities in your mode of celebrating divine service. On the 10th of that month you waited upon me, accompanied by your two churchwardens, and, in their presence, denied most of the statements contained in that letter. Both you and they assured me that you had made no change since the day of the consecration, and that the congregation at large were not dissatisfied. I told you that I did not approve of so much form, especially of the procession with the elements, nor of the choristers receiving the communion before the other communicants. In a letter which I wrote on the 16th of the same month to the gentleman who had made the complaint above mentioned, I gave him an account of what had passed at my interview with you and the churchwardens, and after stating that your mode of performing divine service, which was not disapproved of by the congregation in general, was, as far as I could collect, 'in conformity with the practice followed in cathedral churches,' I added, 'I am bound to acknowledge that I greatly question the expediency of introducing that mode of celebrating divine service into our parochial churches; but if an incumbent thinks it right to do so, seeing that he has the rubric in his favour, I doubt whether I have authority to prohibit it; although if I were made aware of a general feeling of dissatisfaction in the congregation I might interfere in the way of advice and remonstrance.'

"No expression of any such general feeling with respect to St. Paul's ever reached me. In a letter which I wrote to you on the 6th of March, 1849, were these words:—'I certainly understood at that time (of the consecration of St. Paul's) that the prayers were to be read, not intoned.' Since the consecration of St. Barnabas' you have carried your ritual innovations to such an extreme that I have found myself obliged to remonstrate with you more strongly and more particularly than I had done with reference to the services in St. Paul's. And this leads me to complain of an assertion made by you in your published letter to Lord John Russell, as being utterly unfounded. You say, in page 20:—

"My views and principles in the regulation of the service—intending to do, teach, and pursue my way, in the very way I am now pursuing it—all this was known to the Bishop.'

"This I emphatically deny. I knew, generally, your mode of celebrating divine service in St. Paul's, and I had more than once signified to you my disapproval of some features of it; but I had no notion of what you intended to do in St. Barnabas' in the way of additional novelties. As soon as I heard of them, within three weeks of the day of the consecration, I wrote to you in the following words:—

"The accounts which have reached me of what is taking place at St. Barnabas' leave me no choice but to interfere. You are aware that some of the practices which you have at different times adopted in the mode of celebrating divine service in St. Paul's Church appeared to me to approach too nearly to those of the Church of Rome, and to be contrary to the spirit and intention of the rubric of our Church, if not to its expressed letter. I have more than once expressed to you my fear that you were exciting or encouraging in the members of your congregation a taste for forms and observances which would lead them to seek for its fuller gratification in the Church of Rome. That this has been the actual result in some instances there can be no doubt. Whether others have occurred, or persons retained in our communion by the partial concessions made to a morbid appetite, may well be questioned.

"But I am informed, upon authority which I can hardly doubt, that in the services of St. Barnabas' you are introducing still further deviations from the ordinary forms of our Church,

and that practices are adopted and encouraged *there* which have not *yet* found their way into St. Paul's, and which give just offence even to those who have hitherto gone with you in your observances.'

"I then proceeded to specify the particular forms alluded to—viz., your posture, and that of your euates, in celebrating the holy communion; the not giving the cup into the hands of the communicants, and the putting the bread into their mouths instead of delivering it into their hands; the form of words used before the sermon instead of a collect and the Lord's Prayer, and the crossing of themselves by the clergy present.

"In your answer to that letter you attempted to justify the use, not only of those forms, but also of any other which you might from time to time adopt from the supposed practice of the Church before the Reformation, except those which are in terms prohibited; on the 'principle that, wheresoever no prohibition occurs, there the ancient usages of the Catholic Church were meant to prevail;' and you said, in conclusion:—

"On the one hand, I hope it will be clearly understood that conscientiously I cannot forego any of the principles which in this letter I set forth and advocate, and if I remain in the cure of souls, by those principles I must be permitted to abide; on the other hand, as I consider myself morally and spiritually bound not to oppose your lordship in those matters which as diocesan you have a right and a duty to regulate, so I am ready to withdraw from a position in which the possibility of such an event might arise. I therefore place myself in your lordship's hands, as the right and lawful judge in this matter and the Church's guardian.'

"I received that letter at a time when I was too unwell to attend to any business of importance—a fortnight before I went abroad for the recovery of my health. After my return home I wrote to you at considerable length on the 16th of October, combating the reasons which you had advanced in defence of your practices, and stating, with respect to one of those practices:—

"The great objection to the practice (and to many others) is, that it offends the weaker brethren by reminding them of the abominations of Popery, and wearing the semblance of a return to them. Such scruples you yourself confess that it is necessary to consider, though in another passage of your letter you would set them aside as prejudices. You overlook the fact, that while "making concessions to the morbid appetites" of some you are offending the scruples of others. But why is not a scruple, or even a prejudice, entitled to as much consideration as a "morbid appetite?"

"You tell me that you cannot conscientiously forego any of the *principles* set forth in your letter. My remonstrance to you was directed against certain *practices*—practices in behalf of which you offer no valid defence, and which you surely cannot consider of vital importance. If I restrain you from those practices—which I feel myself bound to do as far as I can—I cannot think that your conscience will be seriously aggrieved, or that a sufficient *casus* will have arisen for your leaving the ministry, to which you have hitherto been so zealously devoted.'

"In your answer to this letter, dated October 30, you say:—

"I much less feared the imputation of "Romish practices" than I longed for an opportunity of winning back the souls of men to the ancient standards of faith, of devotion, and of sanctity, which I found the Catholic Church, both in the East and in the West, invariably teaching and professing. I could not permit myself to acknowledge that the Church of England could be cut off from such universal standards. I cannot see how it is that she can be separated and alone in any matter. What is universal must be true. What all ages have loved and venerated she ought not to be permitted to lose. Therefore, as I could best have opportunity (consistent with obedience to those points strictly forbidden or commanded by the local Church, to which obedience is due in its place) I have always made my teaching and ritual practices accord with such Catholic ideas. I feel very great confidence that whatever is Catholic (in the ecclesiastical sense) must be true: what is merely local, not necessarily so; and certainly not so unless made to be consistent with and in harmony with what is Catholic.

"It remains for me to consider whether I can, upon your lordship's repeated request, set aside these principles, and with them, as they appear to me combined, the practices to which your lordship objects.

"It grieves me more than I can say, because I foresee that it will probably end, sooner or later, in the loss of all that I have ever lived for and done in this parish—it grieves me to say that I am unable to withdraw or to alter anything that I have said or done. The principles themselves, as above described, I feel that you would not ask me to abandon; and I also feel that by not abandoning the principles, and yet abandoning the practices founded upon them, I should be a mere hypocrite in God's sight. There would be such a loss of consistency and steadfastness of purpose in the eyes of my parishioners as would cause me deservedly to lose their confidence and support, and utterly destroy my usefulness in the pastoral office. On the other hand, I have very great reluctance to disturb the peace of the Church (if so must be). I dread becoming the occasion of any legal prosecutions, or running the risk of ecclesiastical proceedings; and I think it my bounden duty to sacrifice all that belongs to myself rather than place your lordship under the necessity of appealing to any such means for correcting what in

your opinion is wrong. Therefore, my conclusion is in this difficulty, as it was in my previous letter of July 15, that I ought, if called upon, to resign my living.

“I would, then, put it to your lordship in this way—I would say, if your lordship should be of continued opinion, seeing and knowing me as now you do, that I am guilty of unfaithfulness to the Church of England; and if your lordship will upon that signify your judgment as bishop that it would be for the peace and better ordering of the Church which is under your episcopal charge, that I should no longer serve in this living of St. Paul’s, I would then, the very next day, send you my formal resignation.”

“To this letter, dated October 30, I replied on the 16th of November, having been prevented by the business of my Visitation from returning an earlier answer.

“Being still desirous of bringing you, if possible, to a right view of your duty to the Church, and of inducing you to *obey* rather than to *retire*, I expressed myself as follows:—

“I cannot for a moment admit the soundness of these principles, upon the strength of which you consider yourself to be justified in doing that which is contrary to the order of the Church of which you are a minister, to the spirit of all its rules and formularies, and to the judgment of your bishop.

“I am under the necessity of stating my decided opinion that a continuance of the practices against which I have in vain remonstrated, and of many others which are not sanctioned by the laws or customs of our Church, as well as of any peculiarities of dress or manner which are unusual in our Church, but are copied from that of Rome, is inconsistent with your duty as a minister of the English Church; and I now again call upon you to relinquish them.”

“In answer to this, you wrote me, on the 23rd of November, a letter, in which you abandon the principle against which I contended, and take entirely new ground. You say:—

“I would take the following rules as my guide in the present difficulties:—

“1. I have ascertained from Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Richards, and Mr. Murray, all the points of ritual and ceremony which have been in use in their churches for many years, known to and permitted by your lordship.

“It is my intention to adhere to any or all of these ritual and ceremonial observances.

“2. Your lordship will remember all that was done in ritual and ceremony in your own presence at the consecration of St. Barnabas.

“It is my intention to adhere to any or all of that ritual and ceremony.

“3. I have collected together from various cathedrals of the Church of England the forms of ritual observance practised in them.

“It is my intention to adhere to or to adopt any or all such points as I may find authorised therein.

“Whatsoever is not found or authorised by either one of the above rules, and whatsoever is not found, or cannot be legitimately deduced from the ‘Book of Common Prayer’ or the canons of our Church, it is my intention, in obedience to your lordship’s episcopal requisition, to abandon.”

“In reply to this letter, wherein you clearly gave up the principle insisted upon in your former letters, I wrote on the 27th of November as follows:—

“I cannot for a moment admit that any one of the *criteria* which you propose is binding upon me.

“1. Supposing even that I had not objected (which, however, I have done in the strongest manner) to some practices in the churches to which you allude, there *must* be many things done there which I cannot be cognisant of, and there may be many little things not prohibited by me, the aggregate of which would be very offensive and objectionable. Your plan, it seems, will be to pick out from various churches everything unusual, and to combine them into a complete system in your own.

“2. There was more form and display at the consecration of St. Barnabas than I liked; but I saw nothing decidedly contrary to the rubric—certainly none of those forms which I have since heard of as being observed by you, and to which I have objected. It was not likely that I should take that opportunity of stating my objections to minor points; but I spoke very plainly in my sermon of the danger of excess, and in less than one month from that time I wrote to you a strong letter of remonstrance. There may have been things done at the consecration which did not fall under my eye; and, from what has since happened I think it likely that such was the case. But, even if it were not, I cannot consent to be bound to tolerate now what I did not take that opportunity of censuring.

“3. Even were I to admit that the diocesan cathedral was to be a rule and standard for all the parochial churches in the diocese, it is clear that I could not consent to extend this privilege to all other cathedrals; for if that were done, then, if any one dean and chapter were to adopt extravagant and Romanising practices, I should be bound to tolerate them.

“I have no reason to suppose that there is any custom observed in any of our cathedrals of which I should disapprove, but I cannot be bound by their usages.

“Upon the whole, if you are not prepared to comply, *simpliciter* and *ex animo*, with the

requisition contained in my letter of the 16th inst., I must call upon you to fulfil your offer of retiring from a charge which I deliberately think you could not in that case continue to hold without great injury to the Church.'

"In your recently published letter to Lord John Russell, you declare that what your intention and mine was at the time of the consecration of St. Barnabas, 'in ceremonies and rituals, that it shall be now, please God, for ever the same, unchanged, unchangeable.' It is an unavoidable inference from this solemn declaration, that the novelties of which I complained, and which I called upon you to lay aside, will *not* be given up, although I have forbidden them as being contrary to the Church's order and intention. This leaves me no choice as to the course to be pursued. It is impossible for me not to think that 'the peace and good order of the Church which is under my episcopal charge' would be seriously interrupted, and occasion of triumph given to the Church's enemies, if you were to continue in your present post, deliberately and avowedly disobeying the admonitions of your bishop, and setting up your own judgment of the Church's intention in opposition to his. The evils necessarily resulting from such a state of things would greatly outweigh the good which might be derived from your zeal, ability, and devotedness, supposing the innovations complained of to have no connexion with the erroneous opinions in certain points of doctrine which they are commonly supposed to express or indicate.

"It is with great pain, but with no hesitation as to the necessity which binds me to this conclusion, that I now signify my acceptance of your renewed offer to resign the incumbency of St. Paul's, and, with it, the chapel of St. Barnabas'.

"Praying that the divine Head of the Church may guide you to a right judgment in the things which concern its peace.

"I remain, Rev. and dear Sir,

"Your faithful servant in Christ,

"C. J. LONDON."

THE PROTESTANT AGITATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—I am one of those who think we have had enough, and more than enough, of anti-Papal agitation. All the good it can produce has been achieved, while the evil is still increasing. The good, which I do not underrate, is a manifestation of the strong and universal attachment of the people of this country to the Protestant religion; the evil, the revival of sectarian animosities, and of that intolerant zeal so alien to the true spirit of Christianity, and which has ever been the bane and the torment of every country in which it has prevailed. I refrain from commenting upon the harangues and addresses which for weeks past have been resounding through the country, and filling your columns, and I only hope that in all Europe nobody reads these effusions but ourselves, for they will not exalt our national reputation. It may be a vain attempt to sprinkle some drops of reason and remonstrance upon the raging furnace of popular excitement; but, like everything in this world, abuse and ridicule of the Pope, and railing against the Roman Catholic religion, must at last come to an end. When all this fury has exhausted itself, and people get tired of reading or of hearing the same stale repetitions, they will begin to take a more sober and practical view of the case, and to consider what this mountain in labour is eventually to produce. We shall assuredly look exceedingly foolish if all the hubbub should turn out to have been made without some definite, reasonable, and, moreover, attainable object; and yet we appear to be in imminent danger of finding ourselves in this perplexing and mortifying predicament. We cry out, that an insult has been offered by the Pope to the English Crown and nation; that the ecclesiastical constitution which he has promulgated is illegal or unconstitutional, and that it shall not be endured. When the Queen of England is insulted, or her subjects are injured by any foreign Power, she demands redress, and, failing to obtain it, she exacts it by her armies and her fleets. Are we to hold the Pope in his temporal capacity responsible for his merely spiritual acts, and deal with him by demands and threats, and by armaments to enforce them? I apprehend that no such extreme measures will be adopted. How, then, are we to deal with a Power over which we can have no control, whose authority is purely spiritual, while the visible signs of its exercise are only to be found in a voluntary obedience which no laws can reach and no Government can prevent? Your statutes will have no more effect at the Vatican than Papal bulls in Westminster-hall. You cannot restrain the Pope from elaborating his ecclesiastical polity here; and all the lawyers in England would fail in devising prohibitory laws as to spiritual matters which the objects of them could not find means to evade. Cardinal Wiseman has said with truth, that England could not complain of being taken by surprise. More than two years ago it was no secret that such measures were in contemplation. They were dis-

cussed not only in the press, but in the House of Commons; and on one occasion Lord John Russell made a speech which was so replete with wisdom and truth, and so exactly applicable to the present occasion and to all that is passing around us, that it deserves the most attentive and general consideration. On the 17th of August, 1848, in a debate on the Diplomatic Relations with Rome Bill, Sir Robert Inglis—after declaring that he had no objection to call Dr. Wiseman a bishop, but objected to calling him Archbishop of Westminster—put certain questions with regard to the appointment of archbishops and bishops in this country without the consent of its Sovereign, to which the Prime Minister replied in the following terms:—

“I do not know that the Pope has authorised, in any way, by any authority that he may have, the creation of archbishoprics and bishoprics with dioceses in England; but certainly I have not given my consent, nor should I give my consent if I were asked to do so, to any such formation of dioceses. With regard to spiritual authority, the hon. gentleman must see, when he alludes to other States in Europe, that whatever control is to be obtained over the spiritual authority of the Pope can only be obtained by agreement for that end. You must either give certain advantages to the Roman Catholic religion, and obtain from the Pope certain other advantages in return, among which you must stipulate that the Pope shall not create any dioceses in England without the consent of the Queen: or, on the other hand, you must say you will have nothing to do with arrangements of that kind—that you will not consent in any way to give any authority to the Roman Catholic religion in England. But then you must leave the spiritual authority of the Pope entirely unfettered. You cannot bind the Pope’s spiritual influence unless you have some agreement. . . . But though you may prevent any spiritual authority being exercised by the Pope by law, yet there is no provision, no law my hon. friend could frame that would deprive the Pope of that influence that is merely exercised over the mind, or that would preclude him from giving advice to those who choose to attend to such advice. It is quite obvious that you cannot, by any means or authority, prevent the Pope from communicating with the Catholics of this country. You may try to prevent such communication from being open, but I think it would be very foolish if you took any means of great vigour and energy for that purpose. If it is not open, it will be secret. So long as there are Roman Catholics in this country, and so long as they acknowledge the Pope as the head of their Church, you cannot prevent his having spiritual influence over those who belong to that communion.”

This speech, which is equally sensible and true, and the really practical view of the subject, gives a complete answer to the present agitation, and to those who are clamouring for acts of vigour and for restrictive or prohibitory laws. It is fruitless now to search into the *animus* or the objects of the Pope. He was ill-advised, ignorant of the state of feeling and opinion here, his pretensions were extravagant, and his hierarchy was proclaimed in an ostentatious and offensive manner; but, granting all this, and admitting our indignation to be called for, the question still recurs, “What is it we can do?” It is easy to determine what we cannot do. We cannot compel the Pope to rescind his brief. We cannot prevent the bishops from exercising their functions within the precise limits of the jurisdictions severally assigned to them. We cannot undo territorial circumscriptions which have no tangible character, and which are nothing but local designations indicative of a defined sphere of spiritual action. We cannot abrogate the spiritual allegiance which the whole Roman Catholic hierarchy bear to the Pope, nor obstruct the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion; in which freedom, if it is to be perfect, its episcopal constitution must be included. The people of England, to do them justice, in the utmost heat of their resentment, have evinced no disposition to violate the principle of religious liberty, and all suggestions of returning to penal laws against the Roman Catholics have been invariably repudiated. Well, then, if we cannot do any of these things, what is left for us to do? We are told that the Pope may, indeed, make bishops, but that he need not have sent any here, and that he has sent too many; and again, that though he might appoint bishops, he could not appoint dioceses over which they were to preside. But the Pope himself can alone judge of the necessary extent of his episcopal establishment; and if bishops are appointed at all, it is indispensable, for the mere avoidance of confusion and disputes, that each prelate should have some local attribution; and this can be nothing else but his diocese, the proper and only name for the circuit of his jurisdiction—in fact, wherever there is a bishopric there must be a diocese. But the Pope has not only created bishops, but has given them titles; and this seems to be considered the head and front of his offence, inasmuch as it is opposed to the spirit if not to the letter of our laws, and is an audacious assumption of a power belonging only to the Sovereign of this realm, I am very wise (as people often are) after the event, and can clearly see that the acts of the Pope, together with the language of some in authority under him, have been very imprudent and mischievous; but I doubt whether I should have been so wise had I been aware of his Holiness’ intentions; for though I should have deprecated his purpose, I certainly should not have anticipated an outburst of popular, or rather of national rage and resentment, which has had no parallel in England since the time of the Popish plot. Nevertheless, if we consider the matter calmly, it must be confessed that the Pope had some grounds for thinking that he might make these appointments without any danger of deeply offending this country. He had already created titular

bishops in various colonies with the concurrence and consent of the Government; and the whole hierarchy of Ireland, with their open assumption of the titles of their sees, had been rather more than winked at—the law which forbids that assumption had been advisedly suffered to be a dead letter. But besides this, in the speech of Lord John Russell to which I have already alluded, there was an intimation that it would not be expedient to enter into agreements with the Pope for the regulation of the religious arrangements of the Roman Catholics; and as this opinion immediately followed his *dictum* “that the spiritual authority of the Pope could only be controlled by agreement, and without any such agreement that it must be left entirely unfettered,” I think the Pope might not unreasonably conclude that the British Government were not inclined to communicate with him at all on these matters, and that they preferred leaving him to administer his ecclesiastical affairs in England according to his own discretion. I have ever been very strongly of opinion, that the true policy of England, with her 3,000,000 or 9,000,000 of Roman Catholics, would be to communicate with the Pope as other Powers do, and to concert with the Holy See such measures as the spiritual interests of those Catholics may appear to require. This is the practice of Prussia, and why should it not be that of England? I believed at the time of its introduction that the Diplomatic Relations Bill had this object in view, for it is obvious that we never can have any important secular affairs to discuss with the Vatican, and no need, therefore, of any diplomatic relations for merely political purposes. But that bill was a sham; its real character was not avowed, and in order to make it appear that no recognition of the Pope’s *de facto* authority, even over Roman Catholics, was intended, and that we were not going to communicate with him in his spiritual capacity, the matter was so mismanaged that the bill itself has been totally inoperative, and the Pope himself was offended instead of being conciliated by the transaction. The Lords began by a puerile and pedantic denial of his title as “the Pope,” or the “Sovereign Pontiff,” and would only consent to call him “Sovereign of the Roman State,” and this was followed up by the foolish clause prohibiting an ecclesiastic from coming here as an ambassador. It was as notorious as the sun at noonday, that we had long been in communication with the Pope upon ecclesiastical affairs, in an underhand and clandestine manner, which was equally undignified and unsatisfactory. All statesmen, particularly those who governed Ireland, were anxious that regular and open relations should be substituted, and such was the desire of the Roman Catholics and of the Pope. Between the niceness of some and the timidity or indifference of others, this project of conciliation and practical utility fell to the ground; and the nation is now convulsed by a paroxysm of wrath and indignation at measures which, if they had been concerted with our Government, and arranged in a spirit of liberality and good will, might have been carried into effect without giving umbrage to the most zealous Protestant, or any semblance of invading the prerogative of the Queen. However, all this is gone by. Instead of conciliation and agreement we are employed in vilifying and caricaturing the Pope, burning him and the Sacred College in effigy, and heaping execrations on the Roman Catholic religion. The great city of London is going up in solemn procession to lay at the foot of the throne its superfluous protestations of allegiance, its fanciful complaints of injury, and its vague demands for redress. And how is redress to be obtained? After so much has been *said*, what is to be *done*? “Ay, there’s the rub.”

We cannot touch the Pope himself and we cannot unfrock his bishops. To wage war with the dioceses would be to fight the empty air; to put any restraint on the Roman Catholic clergy would be religious persecution; this all men eschew. Nothing that I know of remains, nothing at least that is accessible and tangible, but to make a legislative attack on the episcopal titles, either by an extension of the existing law or the enactment of a new one. This would, indeed, be but a lame and impotent conclusion to an agitation which has shaken the isle from its propriety; and, before we proceed to break such flies upon the wheels of legislation, it would be advisable to consider what the thing is we are to attack and what has already been done in reference to the very same matter. People talk of the Pope’s making a Bishop of Birmingham as if it was just the same thing as the Queen’s making a Bishop of London; forgetting that while the Queen bestows rank, peerage, wealth, authority, and innumerable legal privileges and immunities, the Pope confers nothing but his own delegated authority to a priest to govern spiritually those individuals within a specified geographical limit who may be willing to submit themselves to his government; and this geographical limit, being marked out for an ecclesiastical purpose only, and placed under the supervision of a bishop, is called, according to canonical custom, a diocese. But the Pope’s bishop has no revenues, and in the eye of the law no authority, no privilege, no immunity whatever; the law recognises in him no power; he has no court into which he can cite offenders, even of his own persuasion. He may be arrested for debt and tried by juries like any other citizen. Bishop of Birmingham he is and will be, in spiritual communion with the Roman Catholics of his diocese; but if Dr. Uilathorne should attempt to assume that title in the ordinary intercourse of society, he would expose himself to merited contempt; and though the Roman Catholics may acknowledge it, no Protestant will.

The Irish Roman Catholic bishops all sign their Christian and surnames; and so entirely

have time and the gradual softening of sectarian acrimony in Ireland moulded apparently irreconcilable rights and claims into harmonious custom, that while even official documents speak of "the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin," that same prelate is content to be everywhere received and to call himself "Archbishop Murray." All this is the fruit of mutual but tacit concession and a sincere desire for "peace and goodwill." Not many years ago Dr. M'Hale, on some occasion or other, subscribed himself "John Tuam," and an angry interpellation was addressed to the late Lord Melbourne (then Premier) to know whether her Majesty's Government meant to prosecute this violation of the law. Lord Melbourne replied that the Government had considered the matter, and, exercising their own discretion, they did not think it expedient to make an appeal to the law. This prudent decision excited the indignation of the opposite benches; but the Duke of Wellington, with his usual good sense and superiority to party motives, rebuked the zeal of his followers and approved of the forbearance of the Government. What practical mischief resulted from the fact of the Irish prelates taking the titles of their sees? and would it have been better to indict Dr. M'Hale, and that he should have been either acquitted by a jury, or convicted in a penalty of 100*l.*, and perhaps imprisoned for refusing to pay the fine? If it was not expedient to enforce the old law then, would it be advisable to do so now, or to ask Parliament for fresh laws? Is it fit to invoke that mighty power merely to repel an impertinence?

I well know how perilous it is to attempt to throw cold water on the fire of popular wrath, but no such consideration shall deter me from speaking out what I believe to be the sober truth. I think the character of my countrymen, and their reputation all over the world, and in after ages, much more in jeopardy than their religion. Indeed, it is not without a feeling of shame, that I see the pusillanimous terror of Popery which is so often and openly proclaimed. What! when we Protestants form nineteen out of twenty of the population, with an incalculable superiority of wealth, influence, and learning, a richly endowed Church, all the great seminaries of education, almost the whole of the aristocracy, a vast preponderance of public opinion, and, above all, with reason, truth, and the Bible on our side, are we afraid of the Roman Catholics?—and can we not defy the open efforts or the secret machinations of the Romish hierarchy? Let me not, however, be misunderstood. Although I think the prevailing agitation exaggerated, and far more than commensurate with the cause which has excited it, I do not think it unnatural or unreasonable in its origin; and notwithstanding the apology for the Pope of which the scope of my arguments necessarily presents the appearance, I join in the general condemnation which his proceedings have elicited. They exhibit rashness, want of courtesy to the Crown, and want of consideration for the feelings of the people of England. It is impossible to expect men to distinguish accurately or to reason calmly when their passions are roused; and all the odious or offensive matter scattered through briefs, pastoral letters, and Popish sermons, has been confounded together into one cumulative case against the Pope and the Roman Catholic faith. The flourish of trumpets, the songs of triumph, the vain boasting with which those measures were proclaimed, justify a large amount of disgust and indignation; but the real injury which the honour and the policy of England are required to redress bears, in my mind, but a small proportion to the false assumptions and ridiculous pretensions which we might well afford to regard with a scornful indifference. I do not, indeed, believe that the Pope intended to insult the Queen, because such conduct would be inconsistent alike with his character and his interest; but he ought to have taken more pains than he did, even for the sake of the English Catholics, to ascertain how his measures would be received, and still more, to be careful that their introduction was divested of every suspicious circumstance and offensive detail. Whatever may have been his motives, he has cast a firebrand into this country, and been the primary cause of a conflagration which time and great prudence and moderation alone can quench. I cannot help looking beyond the present hour, and regarding with horror the prospect of a chronic state of religious discord and sectarian hatred. All men deprecate the renewal of penal laws, but at the same time express a vague and undefined longing to have something done. It is said, that if we do nothing we shall give the Catholics a triumph; but we shall surely give them a much greater triumph if by some piece of peddling and abortive legislation we should have the appearance of being willing without having the power to strike them. I cannot conclude without expressing the deep regret with which I have read denunciations of the Roman Catholic Church in language which is not that of humility, or charity, or peace, nor do I think that it becomes the members of a Church which admits its own fallibility thus dogmatically to condemn the belief of the great majority of the Christian world.

"Divines can say but what themselves believe;
Strong proofs they have, but not demonstrative!
For were all sure, then all sides would agree,
And faith itself be lost in certainty,
To live uprightly, then, is sure the best
To save ourselves and not to damn the rest."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Dec. 8th, 1850.

CAROLUS.

LORD BEAUMONT'S LETTER TO THE EARL OF ZETLAND.

(COPY.)

"Dublin, Nov. 20, 1850.

"MY DEAR LORD ZETLAND,—I perceive that the newspapers have announced the intention of the High Sheriff to call a public meeting to consider the propriety of addressing the Crown, on the subject of the late insult offered to this country by the Court of Rome; and I learn from the same sources of information that the step on the part of the High Sheriff has been taken in consequence of a requisition signed by nearly all the resident peers in Yorkshire. It is a matter not only of no surprise, but of no regret to me, that such a proceeding should be adopted by the country, for the acts in question are of quite as much political and social importance as of religious and sectarian character. The Pope, by his ill-advised measures, has placed the Roman Catholics in this country in a position where they must either break with Rome, or violate their allegiance to the constitution of these realms: they must either consider the Papal bull as null and void, or assert the right of a foreign Prince to create by his sovereign authority English titles and to erect English bishoprics. To send a bishop to Beverley for the spiritual direction of the Roman Catholic clergy in Yorkshire, and to create a see of Beverley, are two very different things—the one is allowed by the tolerant laws of the country, the other requires territorial dominion and sovereign power within the country. If you deny that this country is a fief of Rome, and that the Pontiff has any dominion over it, you deny his power to create a territorial see, and you condemn the late bull as 'sound and fury signifying nothing.' If, on the contrary, you admit his power to raise Westminster into an archbishopric, and Beverley into a bishopric, you make over to the Pope a power which, according to the Constitution, rests solely with the Queen and her Parliament, and thereby infringe the prerogative of the one and interfere with the authority of the other. It is impossible to act up to the spirit of the British Constitution, and at the same time to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Pope in local matters. Such is the dilemma in which the lately published bull places the English Roman Catholic. I am not, however, sufficiently acquainted with their views on the subject or their intentions respecting it, to give any opinion as to the effect this newly assumed authority of Rome will have upon their conduct; but I am inclined to believe that the *Tablet* and *L'Univers* newspapers speak the sentiments of the zealous portions of the Roman Catholic community, and that they are the real, if not the avowed organs of the priesthood. The Church of Rome admits of no moderate party among the laity; moderation in respect to her ordinances is lukewarmness, and the lukewarm she invariably spues out of her mouth. You must be with her against all opponents, or you are not of her; and, therefore, when Rome adopts a measure such as the present, it places the laity in the awkward dilemma I have alluded to. Believing, therefore, that the late bold and clearly expressed edict of the Court of Rome cannot be received or accepted by English Roman Catholics without a violation of their duties as citizens, I need not add that I consider the line of conduct now adopted by Lord John Russell as that of a true friend of the British Constitution.

"Believe me, my dear Lord Zetland, yours very truly,

"BEAUMONT.

"To the Right Hon. the Earl of Zetland."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "MORNING CHRONICLE"

SIR,—The dignified moderation of your articles on the great Church question of the day induces me to believe that you will, on the principle of fair play, publish the following observations on Lord Beaumont's letter to the Earl of Zetland.

Lord Beaumont brings a heavy charge against the Roman Catholic clergy and laity who do not hold the late pontifical letter (incorrectly called a "bull") to be null and void. He says that they are guilty of violating their allegiance and their duties as citizens.

I look in vain for any authority whatever in support of this violent proposition. It rests simply on Lord Beaumont's assertion and *ipse dixit*.

His lordship assumes the whole matter in dispute. He assumes that the pontifical letter is contrary to law, and that those who accept it are therefore guilty of breaking their allegiance. He assumes that the prerogative has been violated. I say this, because (as it is laid down in Comyn Dig., Prerogative, Co. Litt, 90—6, and 12 Co., 76) the prerogative is defined and limited by law. It is a creature of the law. Consequently, it is impossible to violate the prerogative without violating the law of the land. And so allegiance is defined by law. And he who violates his allegiance violates the law. Now, it is admitted by all whose opinion is worth having, that in the present instance the law has not been violated, and therefore our opponents cry out for an *ex post facto* Act of Parliament.

But Lord Beaumont, without troubling himself to show, by citing any authority, that the pontifical letter contains anything illegal, quietly lays it down that to accept or hold it valid is a violation of allegiance; which is absurd. I say so in a legal sense.

And his lordship proceeds to say, "If you deny that this country is a fief of Rome, and that the Pontiff has any dominion over it, you deny his power to create a territorial see, and you condemn the late bull as 'sound and fury, signifying nothing.'"

I will pass over the personal disrespect to the Pope implied by the quotation, comparing a solemn instrument, emanating directly from the head of the Roman Catholic Church, to "a tale told by an idiot." The remainder of the passage is to be disposed of as follows. If, as Lord Beaumont says, the act in question is founded on the assumption that this country is a fief of Rome—that is to say, if it be an act of temporal dominion—it is necessarily contrary to law. But it has never been shown to be contrary to law, therefore it cannot be an act of temporal dominion. It is not illegal, for this reason: because it is an act of purely spiritual power and authority. This distinction was well laid down by Lord John Russell in a debate on the Diplomatic Relations with Rome Bill, reported in Hansard, vol. 105, p. 219, in which he showed that the exercise of the spiritual authority of the Pope in this country is not illegal, and that the Government could not control it by means of an agreement with Rome for that purpose.

What Lord Beaumont says about the creation of titles and the erection of territorial sees, resting on his unsupported *ipse dixit*, I shall not enter into. Until some one has answered the authorities cited by me on that part of the subject in my pamphlet on the new hierarchy, I have a right to neglect the mere repetition of positions which I have refuted.

I will only add (meaning nothing that is otherwise than personally courteous to Lord Beaumont) that his lordship is not considered by Roman Catholics so high an authority on Church questions as he seems to be held by Protestants.

I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

The Temple, Nov. 30th.

GEORGE BOWYER.

In a few days will be published, in 8vo, with Illustrations, and an immense mass of valuable information, price only 6d.,

GILBERT'S POPULAR NARRATIVE

OF THE

ORIGIN, HISTORY, PROGRESS, AND PROSPECTS

OF THE

GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION

OF 1851.

The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations is a theme on which much has been said and written, both wisely and well; but its records are scattered over such a miscellaneous space as to be totally useless to the great body of the people, and a judiciously condensed account of the prospects of this great movement will, it is hoped, be generally acceptable. In this "narrative" its origin and present position will be traced and pointed out; its importance to the well-being of the industrious classes of this country, and, indeed, of all nations, shown as the true source of its popularity; its past authentic history and future arrangements recorded from official documents up to the date of publication.

London: Published by JAMES GILBERT, 49, Paternoster-row.

The TWELFTH SERIES will contain numerous specially interesting Documents.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER-RROW.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE BISHOP OF LONDON
AND THE REV. W. J. E. BENNETT;

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK :

ROMAN CATHOLIC "PASTORALS;" AND
LORD JOHN RUSSELL AND THE PUSEYITES.

[When the Editor of these Pamphlets commenced his labours, he felt assured that a concentrated selection of the various important documents which were daily issuing from the Press would be approved by the reflecting portion of his countrymen, and the indoctrinating their minds with the numerous facts and arguments which these articles contained would not only tend to assist them to form a more correct and dispassionate judgment of the important principles and interests at issue in the nation's exciting views of the question, BUT THAT THE DOCUMENTS SO CONCENTRATED WOULD BE HIGHLY INTERESTING AND VALUABLE FOR REFERENCE IN FUTURE TIMES. If the immense number of letters he has received from Clergymen of the Established Church, as well as its laity, from the ministry and members of many other religious persuasions, all demonstrating their appreciation of the scope and object of the Series—if, he says, these are to be considered as a criterion of the approval his intentions are receiving, then indeed his laborious duties almost necessarily become pleasant, though onerous.

He must, however, state, that when he commenced his responsibilities he little calculated how incessant an application of time would be entailed upon him in its performance, or the heavy expenses which the carrying out of his plans would involve on him and those associated with him; for though the circulation of each of the Series has been very considerable, and is rapidly increasing, still the receipts are not commensurate with the outlay required to enable him to produce so much material at so small a cost per sheet, including the incidental expenses attendant thereon. From a conviction of the importance of the labour of love he has in hand, he is unwilling to withdraw from the performance of duties so generally appreciated, and which he firmly believes are calculated to assist the progress of a right judgment on the "Roman Catholic Question," as well as aid in bringing about a far more energetic emulation of all the benign precepts of Christianity for the good of our common country, and the practical adoption of sounder views of the religious, moral, and social necessities of the inhabitants of the entire kingdom. Finally, *he trusts that all those who duly appreciate his motives, and are at present subscribers to these Pamphlets, will do their best to extend the circulation, either by gratuitous distribution or inviting their friends and connections to become at once subscribers.* He feels that in some respects his editorial duties have not been performed quite so judiciously as might be wished; still he hopes to improve on the past, and he feels his errors are not of a character to cancel a claim for generous encouragement at this important crisis of our country's history.

At the close of the Series it is intended to give a copious Index of the Contents, and an introductory historical epitome of the subject.]

THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND THE REV. W. J. E. BENNETT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "MORNING CHRONICLE."

S. Barnabas, Dec. 12, 1850.

SIR,—An *ex parte* statement of a correspondence between the Bishop of London and myself has been inserted in the *Times* newspaper of this morning. May I beg you to have the kindness to insert the whole of the correspondence, unmutilated, which I now send you?

I would remark that the Bishop's letter, dated December 9, reached me at S. Barnabas on December 11, at half-past twelve o'clock P.M., and that *without any intimation of an intention to publish it.* But I received a note from his lordship, at six o'clock P.M., to the following effect:—

"DEAR SIR,—I presume that you have no objection to the publication of your letter of December 4, together with mine of the 9th. I think it necessary for my own justification that mine should be published, and but fair to you that yours should appear with it.

"The Rev. W. Bennett."

"I am, dear sir, your faithful servant,

"C. J. LONDON.

It so happened that the Bishop's letter was delivered to me imperfect, without the last sheet, and without any signature. I therefore returned the following answer:—

"MY LORD,—Your lordship's letter arrived this morning imperfect. It terminated abruptly

Twelfth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.] [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row; of whom may be had "The Roman Catholic Question," Nos. I. to XI., price 1d. each.

at the conclusion of p. 18, in the middle of a sentence, and without any signature. I presume that in the hurry of writing you omitted to insert in the envelope the last sheet, but the context sufficiently explained what it must have been; so that although in form I need the last sheet after p. 18, I am perfectly satisfied as to what it must be.

“I do not think that the publication of one or two letters will by any means be sufficient. It is my intention, for my own justification, to publish the whole of the correspondence.

“I am, my lord, your lordship’s faithful servant,
“W. J. E. BENNETT.”

As the Bishop has commenced his letter of December 9 by allusion to circumstances so early as the *7th January*, 1847, it will be necessary for me to enter into a full explanation of all the circumstances connected with S. Paul’s and S. Barnabas’ from that period, or even before that, should it be requisite. This it is my intention to do, for the sake of my parishioners and the Church, as speedily as possible. Meantime, all I can at present do is to lay before the world the full correspondence, from which extracts have been made by the Bishop, as I think, unfairly. When the *whole* statement shall appear, honestly and fully given, then will be the time to judge of the right and wrong in this matter. At present all I ask is that judgment may be suspended.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

W. J. E. BENNETT.

The following is the correspondence alluded to above:—

No. 1.

Fulham, July 1, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,—It is with very great pain that I find myself compelled to address you in the language of complaint and remonstrance, so soon after the interesting occasion of my dedicating to the glory of God so noble a monument of your zeal and devotedness, but the accounts which have reached me of what is taking place at St. Barnabas’ leave me no choice but to interfere. You are aware that some of the practices which you have at different times adopted, in the mode of celebrating divine service in St. Paul’s Church, appeared to me to approach too nearly to those of the Church of Rome, and to be contrary to the spirit and intention of the Rubric of our Church, if not to its express letter; and I have more than once expressed to you my fear that you were exciting or encouraging in the members of your congregation a taste for forms and observances which would lead them to seek for its fuller gratification in the Church of Rome. That this has been the actual result in some instances there can be no doubt. Whether others have occurred of persons *retained* in our communion by the partial concessions made to a morbid appetite may well be questioned. But I am informed, upon authority which I can hardly doubt, that in the services at St. Barnabas’ you are introducing still further deviations from the ordinary forms of our Church, and that practices are adopted and encouraged *there* which have not *yet* found their way to St. Paul’s; and which give just offence even to those who have hitherto gone with you in your observances. For instance I am informed that in celebrating the Holy Communion you stand in the centre of the west side of the table, with your back to the congregation, an assistant clergyman kneeling on the steps at each side of you. This I consider to be at variance with the directions of the Rubric, which are, that the priest, standing before the table, is so to order the bread and wine, “that he may with the more readiness and decency *break the bread before the people*, and take the cup into his hands,” and then he is to say the prayer of consecration. These directions, as Mr. Robertson truly remarks, would both be superfluous, if it were intended that he should stand in front of the altar while consecrating. If the second meant no more than that he ought to be seen of the people, while standing in such a position that his actions cannot be seen, it is impossible to imagine why it should have been inserted. I have no doubt but that Mr. Robertson is right in his supposition, that the Rubric of 1662 was intended to provide against those inconveniences which had led Laud, Wren, and some others, to stand before the altar throughout the whole *act* of consecration. The priest, standing before the table, is to *order* the elements, *i. e.*, to place them so that he may reach them from the north end, and not be obliged to turn his back upon the people. At any rate, if there be any doubt as to the meaning of the Rubric, it is one of those doubts which the preface to the “Common Prayer-book” directs to be referred to the bishop of the diocese. Another improper practice said to have been introduced by you is that of not giving the cup into the *hands* of the lay communicants, but putting it to their lips, while it is held by the priest or deacon. This, I am told, your curates are either directed or encouraged to do; and this is plainly contrary to the express direction of the Rubric, which orders the minister to deliver the Communion in both kinds to the people, in order, “*into their hands.*” And this reminds me of another still more glaring impropriety, which, I am told, if it be not *generally* practised towards the communicants, is beginning to take place in *some* instances—that of not delivering the bread into their hands, but putting it into their mouths. Another instance of departure from the established usage of our Church, which seems to be adopted simply from its being a practice in the Church of Rome, is that of beginning, or rather prefacing, the sermon with the words, “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” to which I think it a sufficient objection

that it is adopted for that reason. It is stated that when the preacher utters these words the other clergy present stand up and cross themselves. The last point which I shall at present notice, and it is a grave one, is, that you are said to have administered extreme unction to a young lady supposed to be in a dying state. The young lady's name is King, her residence is No. 28, Chester-street, and the day on which the anointing took place was Saturday, June 15. My informant is a clergyman, a relation of the family. Most thankful shall I be to learn that in all or any of these points I have been misinformed.

I remain, my dear sir, yours faithfully,

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett.

C. J. LONDON.

No. 2.

St. Barnabas, Pinlico, July 15, 1850.

MY LORD,—In the first place, I must thank your lordship for the very kind expressions with which you commence your letter of the 1st of July, and I must say that I feel fully convinced that all you have written has been written, as you express it, "with very great pain." I hope you will give me credit and believe that what I now say in reply is said with similar pain; not said in a hurry, but after much thought, and many days' deliberation. On carefully reading through your lordship's letter, I find there is one specific charge, on definite authority, and with name, while I find many others without definite authority, and without name. And first, as to the former. It is said that I administered *extreme unction* to a young lady of the name of King, and that the "*anointing*" took place on the 15th of June at a house in Chester-street. To this I have simply to reply that it is *untrue*, and to beg that your lordship would communicate to the informer my earnest entreaty that on any future occasions on which he may think it right to entertain a charge against a brother, he make sure of the truth of what he says. I beg to inform your lordship and him that I never used "*unction*," or as your word is "*anointing*," or *oil* in any rite or ceremony, in any place or time, either out of the church or in the church, either in regard of the whole, or in regard of the sick, at any period in the whole course of my life. From misapprehension, ignorance, or some other unfortunate accident, the informer has been guilty of a breach of truth. Next, in regard of those parts of your lordship's letter which reflect upon me in matters of Church observance, not made on definite authority, but given without name, I might with justice refuse to notice these charges until the names of the informers be given, as the more honest way is for the accused and the accuser to stand face to face: and holy Scripture gives us this rule. Nevertheless, I will not take advantage of a technical objection when great principles are at stake, but at once reply to the charges. In the first place, your lordship remarks, as a leading idea or principle upon which the objections made by the informers are brought to bear upon your mind, that I "impart to the congregation a taste for forms and ceremonies which would lead them to seek for its fuller gratification in the Church of Rome;" and you say, "that this has been the case in some instances there is no doubt." I think it would be fair on this point that the names and dates should be given, and that your lordship should communicate to me the circumstances which have led you to say this. It is a strong expression to use, "There is no doubt," and especially when on the other side I venture to reply that at the present moment I really am not aware, nor in my conscience can I recollect, any one single person who has departed out of the English communion from the teaching or practices of St. Paul's. It is of great importance to know the names of the persons in question, in order that this misapprehension of your lordship may be set right, both for your own comfort and mine. From this leading idea or principle upon which the objections are considered, I beg now to enter into the details of each, taking them one by one.

I. *The Standing at the Middle or Front of the Altar in celebrating the Holy Communion.*—This is a point upon which, five years ago, a discussion took place at St. Paul's, and it was left as a doubtful point—though not commanded in the English Church, yet permissible. It has been conceded as a practice so permissible to Mr. Richards, Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Murray, and some others in the diocese. Mr. Irons has always used this practice. In other places and dioceses which, at this moment, I call to remembrance, I would mention the Bishop of Cape Town and Archdeacon Manning. Also Mr. Jebb, who, in his work on the choral service of the Church (which I would, by the way, set against Mr. Robertson, one authority being as good as the other) agrees for the propriety of this custom.—(See p. 503.) I have always used this practice at St. Paul's for the last five years without complaint, and there is no deviation at St. Barnabas.

II. *The Position of the Clergy who assist in the Holy Communion.*—I do not find in the Rubric any mention of assistants; but in the canons there is mention made of an epistoler and gospeller, but no place assigned. One Rubric does allude to "one of the ministers;" namely, that which occurs just before the general confession, and mention is made also of "the bishop" in the absolution, but in neither of these cases is any place assigned. I do not see that there is more authority for the assistants to stand at the south side of the altar than there is for them to stand at the steps; nor is it said which way they are to turn, nor what they are to do. I conceive it to be one of those matters for which we must turn to the usage of the Church prior to the Reformation; and, so doing, I have

adopted the practice of standing at the steps, having an equal right so to do as others to stand at the *south of the altar*. It would seem to be left to the discretion of the priest, according as he may find it convenient and agreeable to decent order.

III. *The Administration of the Holy Elements not into the Hands of the Communicants.*—The expression used by your lordship is “the communicants,” whereby it might be inferred that it was the custom with *all*. This is not so; but the truth is, that there are four persons whom I know as constant communicants, who have expressed a wish privately that they might be so gratified as to receive into their mouths; and there are two who have been formerly Roman Catholics, whose previous habits in this matter I was unwilling forcibly to violate. I am quite ready to confess that this concession is not sanctioned by the Rubric. But what a concession it is, and in what a matter! Where could the charity of the man be, who could watch and spy out such a thing as this (a thing privately done before God, to satisfy tender and loving spirits), at such a time and such a place? It is this point that I am anxious to clear up as to the name of the informer, because I fear, from this and other circumstances connected with your lordship’s letter, that the information must have been from *one of the curates*. No other than they could possibly have perceived it. But, my lord, admitting this to be a concession not sanctioned by the Rubric, what is to be said of the clergy, a long list of whose names I could give, who administer the blessed sacrament to twenty or thirty persons at a time, saying the words of administration to them all in the aggregate, thus violating the Rubric openly and notoriously, and in the face of the whole Church? I know that the deviations of others form no excuse for my own; but still justice would require that your lordship should interdict this custom on the one side, as you now interdict my own deviation on the other. What is also to be said of a multitude of other deviations equally notorious—the mutilations of the Marriage Service, of the Funeral Service, of the Baptismal Service, and the latter affecting a vital doctrine, namely, that of regeneration?—what is to be said of the bishops themselves, nearly all of whom violate the Rubric in administering confirmation, by pronouncing the words of blessing over a great number at once, when the Rubric specifies “*severally*”? *Necessity* is urged as their reason; may not *charity* be urged as mine? I suppose that the objection to the administration into the mouth arises from an idea of superstition; but it is very curious to observe how men’s ideas of superstition vary. At the present time it is deemed superstitious to receive into the mouth; in Edward VI.’s time it was superstitious to receive into the hands. Now it is compulsory to receive into the hands, then it was compulsory to receive into the mouth; and both for the same reason and in the same reformed Church. Your lordship will remember the directions in Edward’s first Prayer-book:—

“And although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years past received at the priest’s hands the Sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary, yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness; lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ’s body *in their mouths* at the priest’s hand.”

IV. *The naming of the Holy Trinity at the beginning of Sermons.*—In the other cases your lordship only remarked upon facts, or alleged facts; but here a great deal more is done. You impute a motive. This is the only part of your letter in which I feel aggrieved, because I do not see how it is possible for any human being to judge another as to *motives*. Your words are:—

“Another instance of departure from the established usage of our Church, which seems to be adopted simply from its being a practice in the Church of Rome, is that of beginning the sermon.” . . . And then you add, “to which I think it a sufficient objection that it is adopted for that reason.”

I admit that it is a custom of the Roman Church to use the invocation of the Holy Trinity before sermons, but I cannot see in consequence that therefore it is wrong to use the same custom (provided it be intrinsically good) in the English Church. Such an argument would abolish, in point of doctrine, the very thing of which the holy name is the representative—namely, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and in point of practice it would abolish the surplice, the Liturgy, the two sacraments, the idea of a church as a consecrated place, and your lordship’s own episcopal office; for what are all these but practices and uses identical with the Roman Church? I would remark, also, that this custom is used by Mr. Irons, at Brompton, by Mr. Murray, at S. Andrews’, Wells-street, and by many others.

V. *The Use of the Sign of the Cross.*—I have been for many years in the habit of quietly signing the sign of the cross at the commencement or ending of all important services, in token that I am not ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, but hope manfully (with God’s grace) “to fight under that banner against sin, the world, and the devil.” It seems to come so naturally and so gracefully from the baptismal font. It seems so beautiful, so simple a type of our love of our blessed Saviour. It seems so called for in this present age of unbelief and worldliness. It seems so hallowing and purifying an invocation of His presence, and of the atonement by which we are saved—that is the first instance, viewed abstractedly and without

prejudice; where the true Christian could be found to object to it is beyond me to imagine. I can conceive a Socinian, or a Deist, or some violent heretic of that kind, to object both to the name of the Holy Trinity and the cross of Jesus, both its doctrine and its sign; but how an orthodox Christian can object (always setting aside *prejudice*) I am quite at a loss to understand. In Bishop Grindall's "Articles on Visitation" it is said, "No persons are allowed to wear beads . . . nor superstitiously to make the sign of the cross when they enter the church." Upon which Collier remarks, "But supposing they did not do these things *superstitiously*, it is possible they might not come within the censure of the article." (Collier, part 2, b. 6.) There may be an allowed distinction between doing a thing *superstitiously*, and doing it with a pure and devotional mind. Why should it be of *necessity* superstitious? Edward VI. and Elizabeth both used the sign of the Cross in touching for the King's evil—both good Protestants. L'Estrange, in his "Alliance of Divine Offices," mentions it with approval. Our own canons speak of it as permissible (30th of 1603). At the end of Edward VI.'s first Prayer book, I find this note: "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame." And it may be observed that nothing in subsequent Prayer-books has ever contradicted this. What we want is to get rid of puritanical *prejudice*, and to judge of matters intrinsically of themselves.

Thus I have gone through the several charges.

But, my lord, what a miserable thing this is—to be so continually watched, pried into, hunted down, complained of, accused unjustly—everything said and done suspected—all good ancient Catholic customs, being not forbidden by our Church, villified—and every act of reverence and solemnity made a subject either of ridicule on one side, or slanderous attack on the other; even the priest's visit to the dying bed the subject of a "railing accusation." Those of the clergy who hold opinions notoriously opposed to the Catholic faith, denying sacramental grace, violating the Rubric openly, disguising every decent ceremony which upholds and teaches it—these are suffered by the popular will to act as they please, while we are the perpetual objects of misunderstanding and clamour. I look at this moment around me—I look at that fearful heresy which will very soon, it is to be feared, so far prevail against the Church, that it will compel the institution of a priest to the cure of souls who has been judged by the Church herself unsound and unfit for that cure. I look at the popular will of this Church, which determines to have it so. I look at the bishops and our other rulers, who either cannot or will not, in a body, and as the representatives and guardians of the Church, resist it. I see the foundation of my faith crumbling away, and all my confidence in its Divine office vanishing, and all my comfort and stay in the labours of the ministry destroyed and mutilated. And what, my lord, *must* be the end?—in the imperfection of human nature, what must be the end? It seems quite vain to contend longer in this up-hill battle—never resting, never making one's footing sure—advancing to-day a little in the building up of some pastoral work, only to have it all pulled down about one's ears to-morrow. My heart is sick within itself, and vexed and torn within me; and I confess that I never was so sore tempted to abandon my position as I am at this present moment. I have followed the Church's work, which twenty-one years ago your lordship commissioned me to do, with my whole strength and energy. My affections have been in it, with it, never absent from it; I have given up all for it. But, no doubt, in my way of doing it I have been mistaken, for zeal may be very often without discretion; and I am bound to hear and accept your lordship's opinion rather than my own. But what must be the end? The end is a growing conviction that I am not rightly, cannot be rightly, according to the interpretation of the Church by the present Bishops, and as it is willed to be by the State, a true member of its priesthood. The end must be, ere long, that I give up the conflict, and seek for peace elsewhere. I would desire to put before you what has been my principle of action throughout, and what shall still continue to be so should circumstances enable me to remain. My principle has been to consider that the English Church is not a new Church, but only the continuation of that which always had existed, reformed of certain specified abuses, and that, therefore, in the practices of this Church, wheresoever no prohibition occurs, there the ancient usages of the Catholic Church were considered to prevail. Just as in the Prayer-book it is stated, "And the chancels shall remain as in time past," so it may be said the usages and ceremonies shall remain as in time past, save only wheresoever it is purposely said they shall be altered. On this ground alone we turn to the East at the time of saying the Creeds, and insert a doxology before and after the Gospel. It seems to me that the very fact of a protest being necessary would involve the continuation of every point in which there was no protest; where nothing is said against it, things go on. If it had not been meant to go on, it would have been said. On this ground would be advocated the use of the cross, both material and signal; the use of lights upon the altar; the use even of a crucifix, when it could be divested of abuse or superstition, seeing that Queen Elizabeth used it in her chapel; the use of the vestment in the Holy Communion, seeing that this is positively the law of the Church. I wish to be honest, and at once confess that such pious and Catholic customs as these, and others such, I would gradually introduce, regardless of puritanical objections, but only considering, as Holy Scripture requires to do, "the scruples of the weaker brethren." And I would advocate them not for the mere love of external show, which is trivial, but for a far deeper object—that of the unity

of the Church, and the bringing within her bosom the lost multitudes of our great cities and towns. I look through Christendom in the east and in the west—in ancient times and at the present—I behold everywhere these customs prevailing, and I cannot bring myself to think that the Church of England is the only Church in the world that would deny them; and when I find that she admits them in theory, while she only sets them aside in practice, I cannot but think that with their restoration—provided that restoration be judicious, and with the people's good will, and the teaching accompanying it be in parallel lines tending to holiness and faith, and by that means (as one with others)—a gradual assimilation with the rest of the Catholic Church would be made, the prejudices of all the different sects and schisms would be conquered, and Catholic unity restored. I see also, at the present time, a purposed and methodical aggression on the part of the State, *i. e.*, the kingdom of the world as against the kingdom of Christ; and I cannot but think that this is the very time when such a judicious restoration might, with God's grace, be more strenuously attempted in order to make our conquest over the world the more triumphant. I feel certain that the world is lost and won to religion, not by internal arguments or by subjective reasoning, but by external operations brought to bear upon the senses, and by objective teaching; and as our blessed Lord preached the Gospel by miracles (things seen by the senses), so I would win back the people to holiness and love and unity by the external magnificence (coupled, of course, with spiritual devotion, and sanctity of life) of her churches, her ceremonies, and her ritual. By this principle I think I can see, and from my humble experience, as far as I have yet gone, the ungodly stirred up and awakened, Dissenters feeling the warmth and stimulus which their peculiar nature needs; Roman Catholics brought to confess that the Church of England has a claim to their sympathy, those that from a dislike to her present coldness fly to Rome for warmth restrained; and kept within her fold; while the only loss to her would be the hard utilitarian, the dead Germanising rationalist, and the avowed infidel. Your lordship remarks, in one portion of your letter, that I make concessions to morbid appetites. It may be true that I do make concessions, and it may also be true that the appetites to whom I make the concessions are "morbid." But it has always struck me that it was the essence of our office, as shepherds of lost sheep, to minister to the diseased, and that we were physicians, not sent to the whole, but to the sick. My thoughts were, that as I best could, my duty was to pay more attention to the appetites that were morbid than to those that were sound and healthy; that is, not by violently thwarting and opposing them, but by "gently leading" them, and gradually strengthening them, until I could, by God's grace, cure and save them. Besides, what may be judged "*morbid*" by us, may be so because we are not sound ourselves; and we have read concerning the beam and the mote: what is morbid to us may not be so to God. It may be ignorance, simplicity, a higher and deeper faith than our own, a purer and intenser love. The appetites of true devotion, sincere religion, faithful love, and earnest zeal, have often been found under some little outward extravagance of manner, which, if we cast it off, and do not bear with it, may cause us to lose a soul for ever to the kingdom of Christ. But I must not go on. I have said sufficient, I trust, to lay before you an honest representation of my whole mind and intention in the things I do, and desire to do. They are not adopted for the passing ephemerata of a mere æsthetical religion, but from study of the Church in its purest ages, and a desire to imitate that which it was in the times nearest to the Apostles. But if I am not permitted to proceed, I hope God will enable me cheerfully to lay aside all that I have at heart, and bear with its loss for Christ's sake. Of course it would be easy for me to contest all this point by point, to argue and haggle at every Rubric, to concede and to prevaricate at every practice, until I should gain the end by cunning and contrivance which I now perhaps may lose. But your lordship's kindness to me on the day of consecration of S. Barnabas' Church interferes with this; and if nothing else prevailed with me, this alone would, that at a time of great discomfiture you consecrated at my petition—and indeed so far recognising the principles which I claim—a church of very remarkable construction and arrangement, so remarkable that it was certain to provoke the obloquy of the multitude. And this you did in a manner, and with a spirit of love, which will never be effaced from my memory, for God knows I very little deserve it at your hands. It is against this feeling of your lordship's kindness to me—special undeserved kindness to me in the last matter—that I cannot contend. Against tyrannical power I could fight to the uttermost; against love I cannot. Hence it is that I have laid bare to you, as to a friend, all my secret heart and mind. I will have nothing to conceal. If you think, upon reading what I have said, that the picture of my mind is not that which could justify my remaining in the cure of souls in your lordship's diocese. I am ready and willing to depart. It would be a great sacrifice, I am free to acknowledge, a sacrifice of all that is dearest to my heart, both from association and from personal feeling; but still it is a sacrifice which (God helping me) I will prepare myself to make, in patience and faith. On the one hand, I hope it will be clearly understood that, conscientiously, I cannot forego any of the principles which in this letter I set forth and advocate; and if I remain in the cure of souls by those principles I must be permitted to abide. On the other hand, as I consider myself morally and spiritually bound not to oppose your lordship in those matters which as diocesan you have a right and a duty to regulate, I am willing and ready to

withdraw from a position in which the possibility of such an event might arise. As my own spiritual adviser, as well as the Church's guardian, I leave myself in your lordship's hands.

And am your faithful servant in Christ,

W. J. E. BENNETT.

P.S.—I beg to add, for your lordship's satisfaction, that, in regard to the administration of the "Sacrament of the Lord's Body" into the mouths of the communicants, I have spoken to the six persons to whom this practice was conceded, and I have induced them to forego their wishes in this respect, and henceforth receive into their hands.

No. 3.

Fulham, Oct. 16, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,—The state of my health at the time when I received your letter, and a great variety of important business demanding my immediate attention, prevented me from returning an answer to it before I went abroad. I now revert to the subject of it with great pain, under a strong sense of the duty laid upon me to bring the question at issue between us to a crisis, and to do all in my power to stop the tide of innovation which is flowing more and more strongly into the Church. I might complain of the tone of your letter, which is not such as I think was due to the forbearance with which I have on all occasions acted towards you; but I will deal only with the substance of it. With respect to the subject of my last letter, you say—"I might with justice refuse to notice these charges until the names of the informers be given," &c. I do not think that when you are called upon by your bishop, you can rightly refuse to answer for what you do publicly in the church. Your public ministrations are matters of common observation, and it is absurd to talk of not acknowledging them till you are confronted with your "accusers." P. 2. *Standing at the Middle or Front of the Altar.*—If the "discussion" at St. Paul's left this practice "a doubtful point," it ought to have been considered as set at rest by the custom of our Church, and at any rate by the decision of the Ordinary. The recent example of four or five individuals, and the opinion of one modern writer, are of no weight as authorities. It is clear that the Rubric is not complied with, which says that the bread is to be broken "before the people," if the priest stands between the bread and the people. P. 3. *The position of the Clergy, &c.*—In a matter not ruled by our Rubrics, you choose to be governed by the usages of the unreformed Church, rather than by the practice of the reformed. If this principle is to be admitted, we may look for many other changes of a similar nature. *Administration of the elements not into the hands.*—It would have been better if you had not attempted to excuse your infraction of the Rubrics by adducing other irregularities committed by other persons. It appears from your postscript, that the six persons mentioned in p. 3 of your letter, received the bread into their mouths, and that you have "induced them to forego their wishes in this respect." But are there none who receive the wine without taking the cup into their hands? P. 5. *Naming the Holy Trinity at the beginning of sermons.*—You say, that if a usage be objected to because it is a custom of the Romish Church, the same argument will abolish the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. But there is no parity of reasoning in the two cases. Our Church has derived from the Church of Rome (or rather from Scripture and primitive antiquity through the Church of Rome) its fundamental doctrine, and many of its practices; and these doctrines and practices have been solemnly sanctioned by the written formularies or daily practice of our Church. But that does not justify an individual minister, at this time of day, in introducing from the Church of Rome any practice which he may think intrinsically good. The same reasoning may apply to (4) *the use of the sign of the cross.* You talk of "quietly signing the sign of the cross." Do you mean that you do not intend it to be noticed by the congregation, or that, in fact, it is not noticed by them? This might be very well in a private person, but not in him that ministers, who must do whatever he does openly before the congregation. The great objection to this practice (and to many others) is, that it offends the weaker brethren by reminding them of the abominations of Popery, and wearing the semblance of a return to them. Such scruples you yourself confess (page 9) it is necessary to consider, though, in page 6, you would set them aside as *prejudices.* You overlook the fact that, while "making concessions to the morbid appetites" of some, you are offending the scruples of others. But why is not a scruple, or even a prejudice, entitled to as much consideration as a "morbid appetite?" You tell me that you cannot conscientiously forego any of the principles set forth in your letter. My remonstrance to you was directed against certain practices—practices in behalf of which you offer no valid defence, and which you surely cannot consider of vital importance. If I restrain you from these practices, which I feel myself bound to do as far as as I can, I cannot think that your conscience will be seriously aggrieved, or that a sufficient *casus* will have arisen for your leaving the ministry, to which you have hitherto been so zealously devoted.

I remain, my dear Sir, your faithful Servant,

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett,
S. Barnabas, Pimlico.

C. J. LONDON.

No. 4.

October 30, 1850.

MY LORD,—I was desirous of avoiding any danger of hastiness in the consideration of your lordship's letter of October 16th, and I delayed my reply until I should have the advantage of mature reflection and the counsel of others. On referring to your lordship's former letter of

July 1st, and my answer thereto, it will be found that the charges brought against me referred principally to certain ritual practices. I noticed to your lordship that these practices were not peculiar to St. Barnabas, but were known as existing previously in several churches of the diocese of London. I also defended them, as best I could, by referring to cases and authorities; but, above all, I endeavoured to set them before you as founded upon certain principles, because I thought that a statement of principles made once for all would not only save me from any imputation of rashness, but also give your lordship an insight into my private views and opinions. I am aware that there is a solemn duty to perform to your lordship, being subject to your obedience as my diocesan in the Church of England, but I am also under a deep impression that my duty to the Catholic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ is greater. I am also aware that I may, however sincere, be mistaken in the views which I entertain, and that it is no justification in one who is accused of wrong to say he acts upon principles, unless he can show those principles to be right. But this was the object of my letter of July 15th. I endeavoured to enter into the question—and it seemed to me the greatest that can occupy our minds at the present moment—how far we might, by God's grace, bring about a restoration of the unity of Christ's kingdom upon earth. It appeared to me that the Church of England is surrounded by far greater danger on the side of Erastianism, and from thence proceeding rationalism and infidelity, than from the Church of Rome; for on the one hand we must acknowledge that salvation is in the Church of Rome, whereas on the other hand we practically see the loss of thousands of human souls from the growing infidelity which prevails among us. I much less feared the imputation of "Romish practices" than I longed for the opportunity of winning back the souls of men to the ancient standard of faith, of devotion, and of sanctity, which I found the Catholic Church, both in the East and in the West, universally teaching and professing. I could not permit myself to acknowledge that the Church of England could be cut off from such universal standards. I cannot see how it is that she *can* be separated and *alone* in any matter. What is universal must be hers; what all ages have loved and venerated she ought not to be permitted to lose. Therefore as I could best have opportunity (consistent with obedience to those points strictly forbidden or commanded by the local Church, to which obedience is due in its place), I have always made my teachings and ritual practices accord with such Catholic ideas. I feel very great confidence that what is Catholic in the Ecclesiastical sense must be true—what is merely local, not necessarily so, and certainly not so unless made to be consistent with, and in harmony with, what is Catholic. Such, I believe, was the substance of my letter of July 15. For further matters in detail, I would ask your lordship to refer to that letter. I need not weary you by repeating it here. It remains for me now to consider whether I can, upon your lordship's repeated request, set aside these principles, and with them, as they appear to me combined, the practices to which your lordship objects. It grieves me more than I can say, because I foresee that it will probably end sooner or later in the loss of all that I have ever loved and done in this parish—it grieves me to say that, after having conscientiously considered all the bearings of the matter, I find that I am unable to withdraw or alter anything that I have said or done. The principles themselves, as above described, I feel sure you would not ask me to abandon; and I also feel that not abandoning the principles, and yet abandoning the practices founded upon them, I should be a mere hypocrite in God's sight. There would be such a loss of consistency and steadfastness of purpose in the eyes of my parishioners, as would cause me deservedly to lose all their confidence and support, and utterly destroy my usefulness in the pastoral office. On the other hand, I have very great reluctance to disturb the peace of the Church, if so it must be. I dread becoming the occasion of any legal prosecution, or running the risk of ecclesiastical proceedings. I think it my bounden duty to sacrifice all that belongs to myself, rather than place your lordship under the necessity of appealing to any such means for correcting that which in your opinion is wrong. Therefore, my conclusion is, in this difficulty, as it was in my previous letter of July 15, that I ought, if called upon, to resign my living. I would, then, put it to your lordship in this way: I would say, "If your lordship should be of continued opinion, seeing me and knowing me as now you do, that I am guilty of unfaithfulness to the Church of England; and if your lordship will after that signify your judgment, as bishop, that it would be for the peace and better ordering of that portion of the Church which is under your episcopal charge that I should no longer serve in the living of S. Paul's, I would then, the very next day, send you a formal resignation.

I am, my lord, your faithful servant in Christ,
W. J. E. BENNETT.

No. 5.

Fulham, Nov. 16, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have been prevented by the business of my Visitation from returning an earlier answer to your letter of October 30. I cannot for a moment admit the soundness of those principles upon the strength of which you consider yourself to be at liberty to do that which is contrary to the order of the Church of which you are a minister, to the spirit of all its rules and formularies, and to the judgment of your bishop. I am under the necessity of stating my decided opinion that a continuance of the practices against which I have in vain remon-

strated, and of any others which are not sanctioned by the laws or customs of our Church, as well as of any peculiarities of dress or manner which are unusual in our Church, but are copied from that of Rome, is inconsistent with your duty as a minister of the English Church, and I now again call upon you to relinquish them. As it is not without the most mature deliberation that I make this requisition, so it is not without the most lively concern that I find myself driven to have recourse to it.—I pray God to direct you in this matter,

And remain, my dear sir, your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

No. 6.

Fulham, Nov. 22, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,—I must beg of you to answer my last letter without further delay. It is most desirable that an end should be put to the present state of things at St. Barnabas. Its continuance is doing an incalculable injury to the Church.

I am, my dear sir, your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

No. 7.

S. Barnabas, Pimlico, Nov. 23, 1850.

MY LORD,—Sir J. Harington, my churchwarden, will present to your lordship this letter, in reply to yours of the 16th instant. I would take the following rules as my guide in the present difficulties. 1. I have ascertained from Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Richards, and Mr. Murray, all the points of ritual and ceremony which have been in use in their churches for many years, known to and permitted by your lordship. It is my intention to adhere to any or all of these ritual and ceremonial observances. 2. Your lordship will remember all that was done in ritual and ceremony, in your own presence, at the consecration of S. Barnabas. It is my intention to adhere to any or all of that ritual and ceremony. 3. I have collected together from various cathedrals of England the forms of ritual observances practised in them. It is my intention to adhere to or to adopt any or all such points as I may find authorised therein. Whatsoever is not found or authorised by either one of the above rules, and whatsoever is not found or cannot be legitimately deduced from the Book of Common Prayer or the Canons of our Church, it is my intention, in obedience to your lordship's episcopal requisition, to abandon. But seeing that, at the present time, I am under an external pressure from a mob, and under threats from persons not my own parishioners, which amount in some cases to bodily violence, it is my intention at present not to make the slightest alteration in anything that has been done at our church for the last five months. But I promise you that immediately this external pressure is withdrawn I will make the alterations involved in the intentions above-mentioned. Sir John Harington will convey to your lordship any further information which you may be desirous of receiving—And I am, my lordship's faithful servant,

W. J. E. BENNETT.

No. 8.

Fulham, Nov. 27, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—I cannot for a moment admit that any one of the *criteria* which you propose are binding upon me. 1. Supposing even that I had not objected (which I *have* done in the strongest manner) to some practices in the churches to which you allude, there *must* be many things done there of which I am not cognisant, and there *may* be many little things not prohibited by me the aggregate of which would be very offensive and objectionable. Your plan, it seems, will be to pick out everything unusual from various churches, and to combine them into a complete system in your own. 2. There was more of form and display at the consecration of St. Barnabas than I liked, but I *saw* nothing decidedly contrary to the rubric; certainly none of those forms which I have since heard of as being observed by you, and to which I have objected. It was not likely that I should take that opportunity of stating my objections to minor points; but I hinted pretty plainly in my sermon at the danger of excess; and in less than one month from that time I wrote to you a strong letter of remonstrance. There may have been things done at the consecration which did not fall under my eye, and, from what has since happened, I think it likely that such was the case. But even if it were not so, I cannot consent to be bound to tolerate now what I did not take that opportunity of censuring. 3. Even were I to admit, which I do not, that the *diocesan* cathedral is to be a rule and standard for all the parish churches in the diocese, I could not extend this concession to all the other cathedrals; for if that were done, then if any one dean and chapter were to adopt extravagant and Romanising practices, I should be bound to tolerate them. I have no reason to suppose that any custom is observed in any one of our cathedrals of which I should disapprove; but I cannot be governed by their usages. Upon the whole, if you are not prepared to comply, *simpliciter* and *ex animo*, with the requisition contained in my letter of

the 16th inst., I must call upon you to fulfil your offer of retiring from a charge which I deliberately think you could not in that case continue to hold without great injury to the Church.

I remain, dear sir, your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

P.S.—I am willing to allow a reasonable time for your compliance.

No. 9.

[This letter appeared in pages 7 and 8 of the Eleventh Series.]

No. 10.

[This letter appeared in pages 8, 9 and 10 of the Eleventh Series.]

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK.

(From the "Guardian" of Dec. 11, 1850.)

The Bishops have addressed the Crown. The address bears evident traces of having undergone anxious and repeated revision. The grammatical slip which slightly disfigures the second paragraph is just such a casualty as will sometimes occur in the process of transposing sentences and interpolating words. But of the amount of correction—and, we must add, of the necessity for it—our readers may judge for themselves, by comparing the original draft, which the Bishop of Exeter, to explain the absence of his own signature, has been compelled to publish, with the copy as finally adopted. Of that draft we shall merely say that it affords only too ample a justification for the presentiment that prompted the few anxious words in which we alluded to the subject a short time ago. In its revised form it is free from obvious objections; and if not exactly the protest which we might have desired to see emanate from the Bishops of England, will probably be considered by our readers as satisfactory a document as they could reasonably hope to receive from an Episcopate so appointed, so circumstanced, and containing such large diversities of opinion as our own.

The address is subscribed by all the prelates of both provinces, except the Bishops of Exeter and St. David's. Bishop Thirwall's reasons for withholding his signature may be conjectured, but have not yet been divulged. Considering the circumstances which have attended its publication, it can scarcely be necessary for us to express our earnest hope that the mode in which it seems to have been prepared and submitted to the Episcopate will serve as a warning, not as a precedent, for the future. Had it, instead of being thrown off by a single pen in Lambeth library, and circulated by post, with a curt note from an unknown secretary, been drawn up, after due consultation and deliberation, by the united wisdom of the eminent persons who were to become responsible for its every line, we should have been spared the pain of comparing the Archbishop's ill-considered paper with the acute and just critique of his suffragan, and of censuring the arbitrary refusal of a Government official to transmit the explanations which one of the two dissentient prelates naturally desired to lay before the Queen. Sincerely desirous as we believe the primate to be of promoting the harmony and general efficiency of the Right Reverend Bench, we cannot doubt that he regrets, as much as ourselves, a course which has deprived the corporate action of that venerable body of its proper force and dignity, and has needlessly brought into the full light of publicity difference of opinions which, if incapable of being reconciled, might at least have been concealed.

On the other side, the question of conscience started by Lord Beaumont, for the consideration of his co-religionists, has found an echo in a very high, if not a very influential quarter. The Duke of Norfolk quite agrees with him; and thinks "many must feel as we do, that ultramontane opinions are totally incompatible with allegiance to our Sovereign and to our Constitution." That ultramontanism would sit uncomfortably on a great English magnate—a high functionary of the royal household, and the dispenser of the palatial hospitalities of Arundel and Norfolk House, we can well imagine; and it is probable that the Duke speaks on one side, as Lord Stoughton does on the other, the sentiments of a section at least of the old Roman Catholic families of Great Britain. His letter, like Lord Beaumont's, is a direct encouragement to a Legislative assault. But the strength of Romanism in this country, even as a political power, is no longer confined to noblemen's castles or the hospitable seats of ancient houses. It is something rougher, more energetic, more aggressive, less English in its sympathies and attachments, and less amenable to influences, which may not uncharitably be supposed to have some weight with the Premier-Duke, Earl Marshal, and hereditary Marshal of England.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—Fearing lest any misapprehension might arise in the minds of some in consequence of my not being present at the York county meeting held on the 22nd of last month, to present an address to her Majesty on the supposed Papal aggression, I beg to say that my absence on

that occasion was quite unavoidable, owing to a severe accident which confined me to my apartment, and which put my attending that meeting quite out of the question. I take this opportunity of saying that I most fully concur in the religious principles and opinions expressed by the Roman Catholics on that occasion, and I trust those same principles for the support of which my ancestors have suffered for so many generations will not only always be dear to me, but will be held sacred and inviolate by me to my dying breath.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Allerton, Dec. 1.

STOURTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—The inclosed is a correct copy of a letter I received some days ago from his Grace the Duke of Norfolk. Having since obtained his leave to make what use I like of his letter, I request the favour of your giving it a place in *The Times*.

I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

BEAUMONT.

Galston-park, Rochfortbridge, Ireland, Dec. 6.

“Arundel Castle, Nov. 28.

“MY DEAR LORD,—I so entirely coincide with the opinions in your letter to Lord Zetland, that I must write to you to express my agreement with you. I should think that many must feel as we do, that ultramontane opinions are totally incompatible with allegiance to our Sovereign and with our Constitution.

“I remain, my dear Lord, faithfully yours,

“To the Lord Beaumont.”

“NORFOLK.”

ROMAN CATHOLIC “PASTORALS.”

The following pastoral letter has been addressed to the faithful of the dioceses of Birmingham and Nottingham, by William Bernard, O.S.B., Bishop of Birmingham, and Administrator of the diocese of Nottingham :—

“William Bernard, by the grace of God and the favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Birmingham, and Administrator of the Diocese of Nottingham, to our dearly beloved the clergy, secular and regular, the faithful of the said dioceses, health and benediction in the Lord.

“DEARLY BELOVED,—Blessed are ye when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil against you, untruly, for My sake; be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven.’ God our Saviour, who cannot deceive or fail, has given us this sacred promise, this heavenly consolation. He has said it to His children of all times, He says it to us, and He cannot come short of His words; rather will He far exceed His promises. Hence do we raise our eyes to Him who is at the right hand of the Father, and abound in consolation. He says, ‘I have confidence; I have overcome the world;’ and He is with us, as He was with Peter, to uphold us on the troubled waters. The rage of unbelief is unchained against us; but the angel of the Lord, who closed the mouths of lions that they should do no hurt, is by our side. What have we seen? We have seen the Vicar of God and Chief Pastor of Christendom and the prelates of our Church held up in burlesque, and their names and sacred offices exposed to mockery and ignominy in every imaginable shape, and that even in the public streets of our metropolis, the guardians of peace and of public decency looking on; we have seen our holiest, our dearest, our most saving truths and mysteries blasphemed by deeds as well as words before the ignorant crowd, and not a hand of any of those to whom God has given His power on earth put forth to protect the religion of the greatest Christian community within her Majesty’s empire from those profanations. The Catholic nations of Europe have also seen how they, in their dearest and most intimate feelings, have been insulted; and not themselves only, but their chief pastor also; not their chief pastor only, but even their God.

“For our parts, dearly beloved, we have to take this reflection to our hearts, that so did they treat our Divine Master in the streets of Jerusalem. And he says to us—‘If the world hate you, know that it hath hated Me before you. If you had been of the world the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world therefore the world hateth you. Remember My word that I said to you: The servant is not greater than his master. If they have persecuted Me, you also will they persecute.’ We are instructed, we are divinely prepared, we see our Lord’s truth in these very things—our confidence is strengthened; and our Comforter and Strength has also said, ‘Fear not, I am always with you.’

“What have we heard? We have heard the First Minister of the Crown pouring out such contempt as a frail mortal can against what we know to be the most holy and sanctifying gifts of our dearest Saviour. We have heard men of the highest station striving to inflame the minds of men, and to raise a moral, or even a legalised, persecution against us. We have heard numbers of her Majesty’s clergy—of those who range themselves beneath the spiritual headship of our Sovereign—men who profess themselves to be the ministers of truth, and justice, and peace, and charity, urged on by this high example, contending in a heated rivalry of calumnies, of

insults, and of every manner of wild mis-statements, against the truths we profess and the mysteries which console us, against the spiritual acts of our Chief Pastor, and against ourselves. They know well, those especially who, from their position, are bound to protect the liberty and peace of all who inhabit the land, know well that, as a body, we are patient, and enduring, and forgiving; that we can neither be stirred to disaffection by their acts nor diverted from our allegiance to our Sovereign; that our loyalty and submission to the Crown and State is an obligation to our conscience, and that our fidelity to our spiritual is the sure guarantee of our loyalty to our temporal head; that in proportion to our carelessness in giving to God the things that are God's is our prompt disposition to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. These things do they know and calculate upon. What other body of her Majesty's subjects, as numerous as ours, if another Christian communion could be found so largely extended over this vast empire, would they have dared to treat as we are treated? For well do they know what energies and passions would be set in motion, which our holy religion forbids us to indulge in.

"And what, dearly beloved, is the cause of this outburst upon our Christian and national liberties? Simply that those bishops who have so long ruled over you are now called by English instead of by foreign titles. Because our Church in England is no longer placed in an exceptional, but in the usual and regular order of its divine constitution. Because we are no longer left to be ruled in our spiritual affairs in that extraordinary way in which the Church is provided for in pagan lands, or where much persecution is raised against her. Literally, because we ourselves had concluded that we were no longer under persecution; because, acting on this conclusion, the Pope has withdrawn the exercise of his powers as immediate bishop from this country, and left us to be governed by our own bishops; because he has left these episcopal powers to be exercised by Englishmen which he used to exercise himself. It is idle to talk of the division of the country as a new thing; it has always been divided by us. These are but lines drawn by the mind, and not a taking of temporal possession. Where there is more than one bishop in a country, how can each know his flock and his work except by marking lines of division? The Pope has, in fact, done no more than appoint bishops in England in the same way as he does in Ireland; as he has changed Vicars-Apostolic into a hierarchy in Anstralia; as he has done in the Mauritius: as the late Pope marked out the new bishopric of Galway; as bishops are appointed in Protestant Prussia and in schismatic Russia; as in the United States of America.

"In vain it is objected that this is the act of a foreign Sovereign. For the Pope has in no wise acted as a Sovereign, but as a bishop, and as the bishop of bishops, as the supreme pastor of the Church. Our Parliament itself made this distinction three years ago. An Act was passed to allow diplomatic relations with his Holiness in the capacity of Sovereign of Rome, but not as Pope. And how could this be done, unless there were a visible, plain, and admitted distinction between Pius IX. as Pope, and Pius IX. as Sovereign of Rome? And, if plea be made that his Holiness has done this act without consulting the State, how could it be otherwise, seeing that by an Act of the Legislature they had declined to hold communication with him in that very capacity in which alone he acts in ecclesiastical affairs? But even this subterfuge is without foundation? For we have it on undoubted authority, that the Holy Father has shown every delicacy and attention that the case admitted of to our Government. Nay, more, it was well known that this hierarchy in no way contravened the law, so long as we took not the titles of Protestant bishops; and that the present head of the Ministry had, on two separate occasions, advocated in Parliament the expediency of our being allowed, by a repeal of the disallowing clause, to take even those titles, if so minded. We had seen the existing Ministry directing that their titles of honour should be given both to the new Catholic hierarchies of the colonies and to the prelates of Ireland, and how could we imagine that we possessed not those liberties in England which were recognised both in Ireland and in the colonies? The Pope had seen an English Protestant bishop exercising his ministry not only in Catholic Malta, but in the city of Rome itself; and how could his Holiness suppose that less liberty should exist in England for us, whose ministry is required by more than a million of her Majesty's subjects?

"And here, dearly beloved, we cannot but be struck with the resemblance between these dealings towards ourselves and those of a certain ancient administration, amongst whom there were found temporal and spiritual rulers combining together against our blessed Redeemer. They insisted that He was a King, and that He interfered with concerns of State; and in vain did our Lord reply that His kingdom 'was not of this world.' They insisted that He had confused His spiritual with their temporal power, and on this plea they crucified Him. He sent forth His disciples two and two into all the country. He taught the multitudes; and these men said, 'If we let him alone so, the Romans will come, and will take away our place and nation;' and therefore they crucified the Son of God. The Apostles divided the whole earth amongst them; and what permission from its rulers did they feel to be needed? Without asking consent of Cæsar, did

St. Peter fix his chair in Rome. Her statesmen could not make St. Peter different from what he was; he himself could not cease to be what he was, and so they crucified him, as they had done his Master. And what was the crime of St. Peter? Only, that he had become Bishop of Rome without leave obtained of the Government. So our Henry II. could not make St. Thomas of Canterbury other than what he was. He could not unmake an archbishop; all he could do was, to add to his mitre the crown of martyrdom. And out of all these persecutions, what came there forth but the victory of God and the spread of the faith? A victory of another kind may be pointed to in the history of religion; but the cases are no longer the same. The true key to the victories over the Church at the Reformation is her temporal possessions. These are gone from us; and in this fact lies our strength, if the grace of God be added to our poverty. For, like St. Paul's successful combatant, we are 'despoiled of all;' our affections are not of this world, and our force is wholly spiritual. And, except through some great canonical cause, we, even we, unworthy as we are of so holy and elevated a place, can never cease to be what God and His Vicar hath made us—the first bishop of our see. Persecution, were it even attempted in more direct ways—by violent acts following upon violent words—would only consolidate and more firmly establish, as all history proves, the foundations of our chair and that of our successors. The rain may fall, the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat against it; but it cannot fall, 'because it is built upon a rock.'

"Our exhortation to you, then, dearly beloved, is, that you confide in God, in whose hands are both ourselves and our works; that you stand firm and united, and without ear in the faith; that you return not evil for evil, nor reviling for reviling, but, on the contrary, blessings; that you endure with patience, as you have always done, whatever temporal inconveniences you are subject to because of your faith, knowing that you will reap the reward hereafter; that you give calm and reasonable explanations to all who ask them of you in a becoming spirit; that you pray for them that persecute you, and do good to them that speak evil of you, as the children of your Father who is in heaven; that you set forth the example of your faith in your lives, and look forward to the blessed reward which God has promised to those who love Him and endure for His sake. And may the grace of God be always with you.

" WILLIAM BERNARD,

"Bishop of Birmingham, and Administrator of the Diocese of Nottingham.

"Given at Birmingham, Nov. 15."

The following "pastoral" address has just been issued by Dr. Hogarth, the newly-appointed Roman Catholic Bishop of Hexham, and read in the various Roman Catholic chapels in his diocese:—

"William, by the Grace of God, and the favour of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Hexham.

"To our beloved clergy, secular and regular, and to the faithful of our diocese, health and benediction in the Lord.

"DEARLY BELOVED BROTHERS AND CHILDREN IN JESUS CHRIST,—In laying before you the accounts of the collection for the week ending June 30, 1850, while we return our warmest thanks for your charitable donations, we cannot but lament their total inadequacy to the wants of our diocese—wants which are daily increasing with the increase of Catholics in this country. It is indeed at this, more than at any former period within our recollection, that we may exclaim with our blessed Saviour—'I say to you, lift up your eyes and see the countries, for they are white already for the harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life everlasting.'

"Since we addressed you last year on the subject of these collections, we have visited by far the largest portion of our widely-extended diocese, and we can speak from personal observation of the spiritual destitution which so extensively prevails in the four counties over which we have been placed by our holy father, Pope Pius IX., the successor of St. Peter, and the venerated head of the universal Church of Christ. Yet, in the midst of this spiritual destitution which afflicts us, we are greatly consoled when we see that, by the unwearied labours of our zealous clergy, and the unexampled sacrifices of the poor Catholics of South Shields and Thornley, chapels have been provided and every facility for the practice of their religion afforded to thousands of poor Catholics in those populous districts. Still, we are urged by the spiritual destitution of the Catholics of Gateshead and St. Peter's Quay, near Newcastle, to send zealous pastors to gather together the scattered sheep of that portion of the flock committed to our charge. 'The harvest is indeed great, but the labourers few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers unto the harvest' (Matthew ix. 37, 38). In the commencement of our episcopacy we were not unmindful of the continually increasing wants and of the loud calls for an increase of pastors; and in one of our earliest pastorals we announced our intention, at no distant period, to call upon the zealous and charitable to aid us in procuring means for the education of a more numerous body of ecclesiastics, equal to the demands of

our diocese. Dearly beloved brethren, we look with the fullest confidence to your well-tryed zeal, your ready and unanimous co-operation with us on all occasions, which has ever been our consolation and our hope, your persevering exertions, which we can never sufficiently appreciate, and your heroic self-devotedness in the sacred cause of religion; and we feel certain that with your aid we shall not fail in attaining the object of our most earnest desires—the increase of means necessary for the education of ecclesiastics for this diocese. The plan we have in view will add no perceptible burden to those with which your poor but generous people have charged themselves. It will neither oppress the poor nor be onerous to the wealthy, or those who are acknowledged to be in easy circumstances. It is perfectly simple in its machinery, and will require nothing more than the constant and persevering exertions of weekly collectors. We propose, then, in order to answer every object for which the diocesan fund was established, and to enable us to found scholarships for the education of ecclesiastics, to the full extent of our requirements in this diocese, that one halfpenny per week shall be collected from every individual who has attained the age of fourteen. We also propose that the pastors of every congregation shall solicit such of their flock as are known to be in easy circumstances, to contribute, according to their abilities, to these most meritorious objects. Thanks to the liberality and heroic charity of the Catholics of the seven northern counties, and to the energy and untiring zeal of Bishop William Gibson, of happy memory, a splendid college was erected in this diocese in the beginning of the present century. This college, second to no other collegiate establishment in Britain, was founded for the express purpose of supplying the seven northern counties with learned and zealous priests, who might labour for the salvation of souls in the vineyard of the Lord, and is well calculated to accomplish this grand object. In addition to the ecclesiastical students who are at present prosecuting their studies in this establishment, there is accommodation for nearly one hundred, who, if pecuniary means were not wanting, could be admitted on the usual terms. The learning, piety, and genuine ecclesiastical spirit for which the *alumni* of this college are eminently distinguished, induce us confidently to expect that the unequalled success which has attended the meritorious labours of those who have hitherto conducted this establishment will continue to crown their unwearied exertions. But unless we be furnished with pecuniary aid, unless we have the means of establishing scholarships, how shall we reap the advantages offered by this eminent seat of learning which is in the midst of us? Means, then, only are wanting to enable us to satisfy to the full extent of our desires the urgent and ever increasing calls for zealous labourers and faithful co-operators in the work of the ministry. And let no timid or too fearful calculator deem our plan to be visionary. We have taken a census of the adult Catholic population of our diocese, and we have calculated the product of one halfpenny per week as above proposed; and we pledge our word that if we receive one halfpenny per week from every individual Catholic who has attained the age of fourteen, we shall be enabled to establish ten additional scholarships, to which we can nominate ten additional students at St. Cuthbert's College. Moreover, in five years all the incumbrances on the various ecclesiastical buildings in our diocese would be discharged, one or two churches erected each year, and all reasonable wants adequately supplied. Can you refuse or neglect to contribute so inconsiderable a sum? Will you willingly forego such advantages as these? Will your charity hesitate to come promptly to our aid when such evident benefits will be the result of your small but zealous and regular contributions? The wants of religion in this diocese are manifest; and the system which has hitherto been adopted to supply these wants is proved in a succession of years to be a total failure. We therefore exhort you earnestly to adopt the following plan:—Let each congregation be divided into wards, and active and zealous collectors appointed in number proportioned to the extent of the ward and to the number of Catholics contained in such ward. Let the collectors each week collect one halfpenny from every Catholic resident in his ward or division, and hand over to the warden the proceeds of such weekly collections. Let the wardens in like manner pay to the resident pastor the proceeds of each week, and take from him a receipt for the same.

“We propose that this system of collecting for the diocesan fund shall commence on the first Saturday in December next, and be continued on every Saturday till further notice is given. But as in some congregations a longer time may be required to arrange for the new system, we further ordain that till the above-named system shall be adopted a collection shall be made at the principal service in every church and chapel on the first Sunday in every third month, beginning the first Sunday in December next, and to be continued till the above-described new system is organised and in full operation. And, further, we ordain that no other collection shall be made, or any way interfere with the collection to be made as above-named for the diocesan fund, and that the collections, whether weekly or otherwise, shall be transmitted to our treasurer on or before the second Saturday of every third month.

“We also make known to you that his Holiness Pope Pius IX. has been graciously pleased to restore to the English Church her ancient hierarchy, and has appointed us, most unworthy, to the See of Hexham, with episcopal jurisdiction over the four northern counties of Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland. We beg a share in your prayers that the appointment may be to the greater honour and glory of God and the good of the souls committed to our charge. We ordain that this pastoral be read on the first Sunday after it has been received, and that the *Te Deum* be said or sung after the principal mass of the said

Sunday in thanksgiving for this great blessing, and that the collect *Pro Papa* be said in every mass during one week from the receipt of this pastoral.

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen.

“WILLIAM, Bishop of Hexham.”

LORD JOHN RUSSELL AND THE PUSEYITES.

The spirit that has been evoked throughout the country relative to the act of the Pope in creating an archbishop and twelve suffragans, seems much more inclined to take against the Catholic Church of this country as a whole, and against a part of the Church in particular.

Now, I am not going to attempt any defence of the Pope or his adherents in this matter, they having placed themselves in a schismatical light, having, by this act, broken a canon of the Universal Church, passed long before the schism of the East and West; but am going to attempt shortly to prove that they who are now called by a most vacillating Prime Minister, to shield himself from the disgrace that should fall upon his shoulders, and his alone—“unworthy ministers of the Church”—are sound churchmen. This cry is again echoed by professing churchmen and dissenters of every grade and degree of dissent, with the most disgraceful vehemence; making their religion, and trying to do that of the Church, as being only a religion of negatives, and not also positives. It is here in one sense that our Church is a negative, that is, she denies certain modern dogmas that the Church of Rome affirms to be necessary; but it is because some of her sons bring forward these, her positive doctrines, more forcibly than is pleasing to these will-worshippers that they are now decried.

I say, that all who profess to be churchmen, and especially those in holy orders, are bound to believe and teach all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and the laws of the Church, viz., the canons, are binding upon them, and to deny and break either one or the other is not honest; if we cannot believe them, we ought, in honesty, to leave the Church, and not call those who do believe and teach them “unworthy sons.” If any priest goes one jot beyond what is prescribed, he is as guilty as one who does not act up to the laws, and the remedy against either is simple—present him to his bishop.

What doctrines do we find so abused by the erratic knight who determined to put down suicide? confession, or, as he calls it, auricular confession. I cannot see how confession can be in any other way than aural; consequently, this bugbear, if it be authorised in the Prayer Book, as I will show it is, falls to the ground. There are two distinct passages to prove this in the Prayer Book, one in the Exhortation to Holy Communion, where it requires for quieting one’s conscience, “Let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of God’s word, and *open* his grief; that by the ministry of God’s holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution.” In this case the Church leaves it an open question to whom her children are to confess, provided it be a lawful minister. The other is in the Visitation of the Sick: “Here shall the sick person be moved to make special confession of his sins.” In this case it is not open to confess to any one, but to the priest, then present; and after this confession the sick person is to be absolved; so that, with all Lord John’s Erastian sneers against absolution, we find that it, as well as confession, is here enjoined.

The next is making a distinction between mortal and venial sin, which they affirm to be Popish. Now, if we turn to the Litany, we find a distinct prayer to be delivered from “deadly sin,” or, in other words, mortal sin; so that, in this case again, the Prayer Book is on the side of these “unworthy sons.”

And now a few words with regard to practice. Bowing at the holy name of Jesus is enjoined in the 18th Canon, and adoration towards the altar is ordered by the Canons of 1604, and not disallowed by the present Bishop of London (see Charge, 1842); and as to ornaments, the Rubric before Morning Prayer says, “The chancels shall remain as they have done in times past.” “And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the church, and the ministers thereof, at all times of the ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the 6th,” which Act is called the Act of Uniformity, and to it and King Edward’s Prayer Book we must go in order to ascertain what these ornaments were.

It is true that many of these ornaments and customs, in the laxity of the last age, were allowed in many places to grow into disuse, though, in almost all cathedral churches, St. George’s Chapel, and very many county churches, such practices as bowing to the altar, preaching in the surplice, daily prayers, decorating the church on the great festivals with flowers, &c., are practised. Lighted candles are enjoined by Act of Parliament, passed in Henry VIII.’s reign, to give force to the proclamations; during King Edward’s minority in these words, the clergy “shall suffer, from henceforth, no torches or lights to be set afore any image or picture, but only two lights upon the High Altar before the Sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still.”

I do not at all enter into the question, whether these doctrines, or practices, are in accordance with the doctrine of the Bible; but, as I said, they being in the Prayer Book, we as English churchmen are bound to obey them, and those denying or breaking through them cannot be

looked upon as true and faithful children of that mother who gave them spiritual birth in the holy waters of baptism.

The prejudice that exists against these "unworthy sons" would soon be obliterated, if Englishmen would use as much sound sense in investigating this important subject as they do in far less vital ones, and not suffer themselves to be led away by the senseless clamour of opinionated aldermen, and designing practices of Whig Premiers.

What is Lord John's present spleen vented against them for? His late pastor protested against his usurpation of the royal prerogative, which now he seems so jealous about, after having done so much to destroy even what little remained. It was his suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics, giving precedence to Irish Romanists, that originated the Oxford movement; his appointing a Bishop accused of unsoundness in the Faith, and against whose consecration thirteen Bishops protested, and his recent conduct in the Gorham case, that has made churchmen begin to look about and see how, in the Queen's name—Go! bless her!—he has abused her most sacred prerogatives.

Who opposed the abominable Poor Laws? The churchmen he now decries. Who opposed the unlimited competition in flesh and blood, in the factory districts, against him and (I am ashamed to write it) the liberal Bishop of Manchester, who ought to befriend and not oppress the poor, in order to curry favour with the rich? The churchmen he is now trying to rouse the passions of the people against.

† People of England! be not deceived; these men do not wish to enslave you in either mental or bodily darkness, as they are now accused of wishing to do. Is feeding the poor, establishing dispensaries and schools, visiting the sick and afflicted, giving you daily, almost hourly, opportunities of praying to and praising God, the means of enslaving your souls? No: it is their highest duty, as it is their greatest privilege, to lead you to that rest and peace of mind which only is to be gained through a religious life; and it is because they are trying to win back the Church's rights against State usurpation and Erastianism, so that they may carry out these holy designs of feeding Christ's sheep, both mentally and bodily, showing the rich their duties and privileges, and the poor their duty and obedience also, that we now find them villified. But the good sense of England will show Lord John Russell that he has failed this time to blind their eyes to his usurpations, and that they will have their rights.

CONTENTS.

THE "ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION."

FIRST SERIES—*T* 2 Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the Two Letter to the "Times" by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the "New Batch of Bishops," from the "Weekly Dispatch;" Two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;" concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, November 2nd, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square-Rooms, November 7th, 1850.

THIRD SERIES—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the "Vatican Masquerade."

FOURTH SERIES—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, an original article by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the "Queen and the Pope."

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and Leading Articles from the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note by the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of "Catholiceus;" Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic Explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

SEVENTH SERIES.—Leading Articles on Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto, from the Daily and Weekly Press; also Letters and Replies from the Bishops of the Established Church.

EIGHTH SERIES.—Letter from Joseph Hume, Esq., M.P.; Fourteen Letters from Bishops of the Established Church; Dr. Doyle's Sermon, Nov. 17th; Catholic Bishop of Newport's Pastoral; and a Letter from a Correspondent.

NINTH SERIES.—Mr. Roebuck's Letter to Lord John Russell; the Rev. Mr. Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell; and Letter from Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., M.P., to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

TENTH SERIES.—Sermons by Cardinal Wiseman at St. George's Catholic Church, Southwark; Letters from Dr. Cumming and Mr. Bowyer; and the Address from the Bishops to the Queen.

ELEVENTH SERIES.—Addresses to the Crown; Resignation of Mr. Bennett, of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; the Protestant Agitation, by "Carolus;" and Lord Beaumont's Letter to the Earl of Zetland.

THE THIRTEENTH SERIES will contain various important documents.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series.

THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE CANTERBURY AND EXETER CORRESPONDENCE;
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S & THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SECOND LECTURE;
THE REV. DR. MNEILE;
THE BISHOP OF NORWICH; AND
EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

THE CANTERBURY & EXETER CORRESPONDENCE.

No. I.

Lambeth Palace, November 15, 1850.

MY LORD,—The Archbishop of Canterbury desires me to acquaint your lordship, that it being the opinion of the bishops whom he had the opportunity of consulting, that an address should be presented to her Majesty from the Episcopal Bench on the subject of the recent aggression from Rome, the accompanying address has been drawn up, to which, if permitted, he will add your lordship's signature.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your obedient humble Servant,
The Lord Bishop of Exeter. FELIX KNYVETT, Secretary.

No. II.

Transmitted with No. I., under cover, superscribed *Immediate*, J. B. Cantuar.—The Lord Bishop of Exeter, &c.

We, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, approach your Majesty with sentiments of veneration and loyalty at a time when an unparalleled insult has been offered to your Majesty's prerogative, and to the Church of which your Majesty is the earthly head in this kingdom.

It is declared by the constitutional laws of our country that no foreign prelate or potentate hath or ought to have therein any authority or jurisdiction, temporal or spiritual.

But, in defiance of this principle of our constitution, the Pope of Rome hath assumed the right of assigning spiritual power and jurisdiction over the people of this country to persons of his own selection, and, in nominating them to particular places or sees, has claimed the same authority as is exercised by your Majesty in appointing the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England.

It is part of the same assumption that our country, whose profession of faith is founded upon the pure word of God, is treated as having been without religion, and is congratulated upon being restored, after an interval of three hundred years, to a place amongst the Churches of Christendom. The return of our people is anticipated to a communion which they deliberately renounced; renounced, because it maintains practices "repugnant to God's word," inculcates "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," and prescribes as necessary to salvation doctrines "grounded on no warranty of Scripture."

We consider it our duty to record our united protest against this attempt to subject our people to a spiritual tyranny from which they were freed at the Reformation. And we make our humble petition to your Majesty that such means may be taken, and such measures sanctioned, as may seem best fitted to counteract a scheme which threatens to disturb the peace of the realm, and to impede the labours of our clergy in diffusing the light of pure religion amongst the people lawfully committed to their charge.

J. B. CANTUAR.

No. III.

Bishopstowe, Torquay, November 19, 1850.

SIR,—I am sorry that your letter, having been addressed to me at Exeter, did not reach me until Sunday; and as I was obliged to leave home, on diocese business, yesterday, at a very early hour, I could not answer so soon as you might expect.

Thirteenth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.] [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row; Of whom may be had "The Roman Catholic Question," Nos. I. to XII.

I am still more sorry to say that, on reading attentively the address to which you offer to append my name, I find matter stated in it which I cannot honestly subscribe.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

Felix Knyvett, Esq.

H. EXETER.

No. IV.

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

The humble petition of Henry, Bishop of Exeter.

Sheweth,—That your petitioner largely participates in the general indignation of your Majesty's subjects, especially of the bishops and clergy, at the recent aggression of the Bishop of Rome on the imperial dignity of your Majesty's Crown, and on the spiritual rights of the Church of England, as a branch of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Your petitioner forbears from obtruding on your Majesty a declaration of the many reasons on which this, his feeling, is founded.

But he intreats your Majesty to believe that he should most gladly have joined with those of his brethren who have presented an address to your Majesty on this occasion, if he could conscientiously have subscribed that address. The reasons which forbade his doing so he should have stated to those of his brethren who drew up that document if any opportunity had been given to him; and he now presumes, in all humility, to lay them before your Majesty.

Firstly—The grounds taken in that address for resisting the aggression of the Pope appear to him wholly beside the occasion. "Insult to your Majesty's prerogative," "inconsistency with the constitutional laws of the country," and "defiance of the principle of our constitution," are matters of the gravest moment indeed; but they appertain solely to the relations between your Majesty and your subjects. And, as regards a foreign potentate, who can neither be supposed to know, nor required to respect them, they are altogether out of place. For your petitioner cannot forget, that, to deal with any proceeding of the Pope, as if it were not the proceeding of a foreigner, would be to recognise his having a rightful *status*, in other words, "pre-eminence and authority," in this country, which both the solemn conviction of his own mind, and the oath repeatedly taken by him, alike compel him to deny.

Looking at the recent act of the Pope in this its true light, your petitioner feels that it would ill-become him to express to your Majesty any judgment upon it. As the act of a foreign Sovereign, it presents, indeed, most weighty subjects of consideration to jurists and statesmen, no less than whether the parcelling out of your Majesty's realm of England into dioceses, and the placing over them, by a foreign potentate, bishops selected by himself, be, or be not, an infraction of the law of nations.

If it be, he cannot doubt that your Majesty has been advised, or will soon be advised, by your Ministers, to demand the revocation of an act so grossly insulting to your royal dignity. He is confirmed in this conviction by a recently-published letter of the chief of those Ministers, in which, with laudable zeal for your Majesty's honour, he proclaims his own indignation, and stimulates the indignation of your people; describing the Papal act as "the aggression of a foreign Sovereign, in all whose documents there is an assumption of power; a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England; and a claim to sole and undivided sway, which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy;" and adding, in words not more eloquent than they are befitting his high place in your Majesty's Councils, that "no foreign prince will be permitted to fasten his fetters upon a nation which has so long and so nobly vindicated its right to freedom of opinion, civil, political, and religious."

Looking at what seems to be the necessary import of such a declaration, issuing from such a quarter, your petitioner, as a Christian bishop deprecating the horrors of war, may be permitted to express his joy that, by a recent statute, passed on the application of your Majesty's present Ministers, with wise foresight of the importance of being enabled to hold diplomatic intercourse with the Pope, "the temporal sovereignty of the Roman States," all doubt of the lawfulness of such intercourse has been removed. For, in no way could that intercourse be more auspiciously or more beneficially commenced, than by sending an accredited envoy, peaceably to negotiate that reparation for an enormous wrong which it might else have been necessary at once to extort by military force.

Nor is this the only particular in which is manifested the importance of the consideration, that the act in question is the act of a foreign Sovereign. This makes it a matter of grave inquiry, whether the acceptance of oaths so formed, by persons so appointed, being subjects of your Majesty, who thus carry into effect the daring aggression of a foreign power on the independence of the British Crown, be an offence against the laws of England? and, if it be, what course must be taken to satisfy the demands of justice, and the honour of our outraged Sovereign?

Such is the first consideration which made it impossible for your petitioner to subscribe the address to your Majesty, which was presented by his brethren.

Secondly—Your petitioner could not truly say with them, that the Pope, by appointing bishops to sees in this country, has "assigned to them spiritual power and jurisdiction over the people in this country" in the only sense in which the "principle of our constitution, that no foreign prelate or potentate hath, or ought to have, in this realm, any authority or jurisdic-

tion, temporal or spiritual," is consistent with truth, or justice, or the rights of conscience. For, the authority and jurisdiction thus denied to be had by the Pope in this country, is, and can only be understood to be, authority and jurisdiction in the *external* forum—coactive power—that authority and jurisdiction which the laws recognise and enforce. For, it is a known maxim of law—"Id habemus, quod jure habemus;" and in no other sense than this could any conscientious person swear in the words of the oath of abjuration; it being known, or believed, by all that the Pope *hath*, in fact, authority and jurisdiction, *in foro conscientiæ*, over all who are in communion with him.

Thirdly—Your petitioner could not join his brethren in saying that "the Pope, by nominating persons selected by himself to particular places, has claimed to exercise the same authority as is exercised by your Majesty in appointing the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England.

For this manifestly implies that the authority which is *exercised* by your Majesty, in appointing Archbishops and Bishops, is the same as that which is *claimed* by the Pope; in other words, not merely to name persons, who shall receive spiritual mission at the hands of those who are empowered by God to confer it, but himself to confer it, as being the only source of purely spiritual authority to those who are competent to receive it.

Such authority, as it cannot be exercised by any lay power, however exalted, so it would be undutiful and disloyal to suppose that your Majesty hath ever claimed, or ever will claim. It would make you solely responsible to Almighty God for the worthiness of the person appointed by you, as if there were not implied in the nomination itself the necessary limitation that the person so nominated be found, by those to whom the inalienable right and duty of examining doth by the law of God belong, worthy of the sacred office and charge to which he is nominated.

Fourthly—But, fourthly, he could not honestly concur with the address in characterising the recent aggression of the Pope as "unprecedented." The notorious practice in Ireland during the last two centuries, and one especial case, respecting the Papally-appointed diocese of Galway within our own times, would alone forbid his so applying that term. But these are very far indeed from being the only, or the principal, instances of the same daring presumption of Rome. For we have ourselves witnessed almost all the British colonies divided into dioceses by the Pope, and bishops from among the subjects of your Majesty placed over them by the same foreign potentate, with the declared countenance and official support of your Majesty's present Ministers.

Fifthly, and lastly—There remains another, and an incomparably stronger reason than any of the preceding, for your petitioner's withholding his signature from the address of his brethren; for that address designated your Majesty as "the earthly head of the Church in this kingdom."

Reared and nurtured, as it is your petitioner's happiness to have been, in the true faith of Christ, and humbly recognising, as an essential article of that faith, that there is not, and cannot be, more than one head, even Christ, of the one body, the Church, which is itself one, now militant in earth, hereafter to be triumphant in heaven, your petitioner, while he presumes not to express any judgment on the sentiments or language of others, could not without deeply wounding his own conscience give the title of "earthly Head of the Church" to any human being, not even to your Majesty, whom, above all other human beings, he, from his heart, acknowledges himself bound to honour.

In truth, he cannot doubt that such a title, without restrictions and qualifications, which would render it unmeaning, it would be as offensive to your Majesty to receive from him, as it would be sinful in himself to offer. For, although it was borne by King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., under a statute of the 26th year of the former, yet it is notorious that that statute falsified the concession of "the clergy in their convocations," which it cites as acknowledging the title, suppressing the qualification, without which not even the royal menace of the penalties of *præmonitione* (incurred previously by admitting the legateine power of Wolsey) could have extorted the concession. The terms of that qualification were, "so far, and only so far, as the law of Christ permits." In other words, and virtually, *not at all*.

That your Majesty's feeling is in accordance with this principle your petitioner cannot doubt, by reason of the sacredness of the principle itself. But he also rejoices to remember that the one Sovereign whom, in the long line of your Majesty's royal predecessors, we recognise as your truest prototype, the illustrious Queen Elizabeth, refused with horror to receive the title, alter the statute which had conferred it had been repealed by her sister. The matter is recorded by Bishop Jewell, in words which your petitioner is confident that your Majesty would adopt as your own. "The Queen," so wrote Jewell to a correspondent abroad, "the Queen will not consent to be called the Head of the Church, either by word or in writing. When asked on the subject, she answered with all gravity, 'That is a name which has been given to Christ, and to Christ only: by no mortal whatsoever can it be borne.'"

But, even if this grave consideration of duty were less manifest than it is, still your petitioner would see sufficient reason for declining to ascribe that title to your Majesty in the reproaches which, on account of it, have been hitherto falsely showered upon our Church by Romanists, and Presbyterians, and enemies of every kind; but which would be false no

hence if the universal voice of the English Episcopate should sanction the unallowed phrase.

For these reasons your petitioner has found it his painful duty to withhold his signature from the address which other bishops (he knows not how many) have laid before your Majesty. Yet he ventures humbly, but confidently, to beseech your Majesty to believe that his dutiful attachment to your august person and sacred office is no less sincere or less ardent than that of any of his brethren.

That it may please Almighty God long to preserve to our Church the gracious protection of your Majesty—the supreme governor of this realm—and your co-operation and support in all the labours of the bishops and clergy for the spiritual welfare of your people, is, and, while life is continued to him, ever will be, the fervent prayer of your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subject,

H. EXETER.

Bishopstowe, November 22, 1850.

No. V.

Addington-park, Croydon, November 22.

MY LORD—The accompanying address to her Majesty having undergone some revision since it was communicated to your lordship, I am directed to inquire whether the objections are removed which induced you to withhold your signature, and whether your lordship's name may now be added to those of the other Bishops.

I have the honour to remain, my lord, your lordship's obedient and humble Servant,

J. THOMAS.

No. VI.

We, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, approach your Majesty with sentiments of veneration and loyalty, at a time when an unwarrantable insult has been offered to the Church in this kingdom over which your Majesty's authority is supreme.

This our country, whose profession of faith is founded on the pure word of God, is treated by the Bishop of Rome as having been a heathen land; and is congratulated upon being restored, after an interval of three hundred years, to a place amongst the Churches of Christendom. The return of our people is anticipated to a communion the errors and corruptions of which they deliberately renounced; and which continues to maintain "practices repugnant to God's word" inculcates "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," and prescribes as necessary to salvation the belief of "doctrine grounded on no warranty of Scripture."

It is part of the same assumption that, in defiance of the law which declares that no "foreign prelate or potentate shall use or exercise any manner of power, authority, or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm," the Bishop of Rome has assumed the right of exercising spiritual dominion over the people of this country; and in nominating certain Romish ecclesiastics to particular places or sees in England, has revived his claim of supremacy over this realm, and has usurped a prerogative constitutionally belonging to your Majesty alone.

We consider it our duty to record our united protest against this attempt to subject our people to a spiritual tyranny from which they were freed at the Reformation.

And we make our humble petition to your Majesty to discountenance, by all constitutional means, the claims and usurpations of the Church of Rome, by which religious divisions are fostered, and the labours of our clergy impeded in their endeavours to diffuse the light of pure religion amongst the people committed to their charge.

No. VII.

Bishopstowe, Torquay, November 23, 1850.

REV. SIR—I have this day received your letter of the 22nd inst., accompanying a copy of "an Address to her Majesty from the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England," which your letter informs me has undergone some revision," and stating that "you are directed to inquire whether the objections are removed which induced me to withhold my signature, and whether my name may now be added to those of the other bishops."

In answer to this inquiry, I am bound to say that I cannot even now subscribe the address, though some of the objections which before presented themselves to me have been removed.

But this is not all. The former communication, made to me in a printed letter, dated "Lambeth Palace, Nov. 15, 1850," and signed "Felix Knyvett, sec.," contained a printed copy of an "address, which has been drawn up, and to which, if permitted, the archbishop would add my signature."

As there was not the slightest intimation that the address so "drawn up," and already signed by others, was offered to me as open to further consideration, much less as open to the expression of any judgment of mine—as, on the contrary, it was superscribed "Immediate, J. B. Cantuar.," I answered by saying, that, on reading attentively the address, I found matters in it which I could not honestly subscribe." I have deemed it

my duty to send "a humble petition" to the Home Secretary for presentation "to her Majesty," stating the reasons for which I could not join my brethren in their address. Those reasons, though founded in part on matters which are now, I perceive, omitted, were also in part founded on matters which still remain in the address which has been communicated to me by you.

I have the honour to be, Reverend Sir, your obedient and faithful servant,

Rev. J. Thomas.

H. EXETER.

Whitehall, Dec. 4, 1850.

MY LORD—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's letter of the 22nd ult., inclosing to me a document purporting to be a petition to the Queen, with a request that I would present it to her Majesty.

As this document contains no prayer addressed to the Queen, and is not in the usual form of petitions or addresses to the Crown, it does not appear to me to be one which the Secretary of State could properly lay before her Majesty. I have, therefore, the honour to return it to your lordship.

I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's obedient servant,

G. GREY.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Exeter, Bishopstowe, Torquay.

Bishopstowe, Torquay, December 5, 1850.

SIR—I have this day had the honour of receiving your letter to me of the 4th inst., in which you acknowledge the receipt of my letter to you of the 22nd, "inclosing a document, purporting to be a petition to the Queen, with a request that you would present it to her Majesty."

You inform me that, "as this document contains no prayer addressed to the Queen, and is not in the usual form of petitions or addresses to the Crown, it does not appear to be one which the Secretary of State could properly lay before her Majesty," and that you "have therefore returned it to me."

To the two reasons which made you deem it improper to lay the document before her Majesty, I have the honour to answer as follows:—

1. To the first, by referring you to the passage which immediately precedes the concluding declaration of what is, and ever will be, my prayer to God for her Majesty—which passage I intended, when I wrote it (and so I still understand it), to be *the prayer of my petition to her Majesty*, viz., "For these reasons, your petitioner has found it his painful duty to withhold his signature from the address, which other bishops (he knows not how many) have laid before your Majesty. Yet he ventures, humbly but confidently, to beseech your Majesty to believe, that his dutiful attachment to your august person and sacred office is not less sincere, or less ardent, than that of any of his brethren." In saying "humbly beseech," instead of "humbly pray your Majesty," no thought could be further from my mind, than that the phrase could be misconstrued into anything bearing the shadow of disrespect. It was, in truth, dictated solely by a feeling which I am sure that her Majesty would not disapprove—I mean, reluctance to use the word "pray" applied to my earthly Sovereign, in immediate juxtaposition with the words of prayer to the King of kings.

I should have the less apprehension that such an objection as this—even if it had presented itself to my mind, which it did not—could exist against the presentation of my petition, because, in "the document purporting to be a petition" from the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops to King James II., there is absolutely no expressed prayer whatever, but merely a statement of the reasons for which they, by implication, pray their Sovereign not to deem them less loyal than some of their brethren, because they declined to do what had been done by others, but what they could not conscientiously do themselves.

Exactly similar, I submit, would be the document which is now returned to me, even if it did not contain that special prayer to which I have had the honour of inviting your attention.

True it is that the petition of the seven bishops was not sent to the Secretary of State, but was presented to their Sovereign by themselves; true also it is that, instead of being returned to them, it was made the ground of an indictment for a seditious libel. In these respects, I fully admit that the two cases are not parallel.

2. To the second objection. That "this document is not in the usual form of petitions or addresses to the Crown," I have the honour to answer, by referring you to the heading of the document, "To the Queen's most excellent Majesty, the humble petition of Henry Bishop of Exeter, sheweth"—and to the conclusion of it, which, instead of what is, I believe, the more usual form, "and your petitioners will ever pray, &c.," substitutes for the " &c." a declaration of the special prayer which, in substance, I do, and ever will, offer up to Almighty God for that Sovereign who is not less the object of my dutiful affection than of my devoted loyalty. That her Majesty would not, on account of such a departure from the usual, but, in my poor judgment, not very decorous, form, con-

sider my petition the less respectful, I most confidently express my entire and undoubting conviction.

In conclusion, as others of her Majesty's loyal subjects may be deprived of an opportunity of laying the expression of their feelings, on any momentous subject, before their beloved Sovereign, by falling into the same or similar error, I shall be doing an act of kindness towards them, if I warn them of what they must, in that case, expect, and I shall, at the same time, save the Secretary of State not only some trouble, but also the pain which that high officer cannot but feel whenever, as in the present instance, consideration of official duty may compel him to stand between her Majesty and the humblest of her subjects, who may have occasion to assure her Majesty of his dutiful and loyal devotion to her person and government. I shall, therefore, make public the communication which I have this day received from you.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient Servant,
H. EXETER.

The Right Hon. Sir George Grey, Bart.

P.S. Since this letter was written it has occurred to me that my petition has not, at its commencement, the words, "May it please your Majesty." But I can hardly suppose that the absence of this *formula*, however usual it may be, has been deemed sufficient to condemn my petition as unworthy of meeting the royal eye. I cannot doubt that, if strict etiquette had made it indispensable, you would have apprised me of the rule, in order that I might supply the heedless omission.

But I have the satisfaction of seeing that, in this particular also, the petition of the seven bishops to King James II. resembled my own. The words, "May it please your Majesty," were not inserted in it. The following is its introduction:—

"TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"The humble Petition of William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and divers others of the Suffragan Bishops, &c.,

"Humbly sheweth," &c.

Of this, it will be seen that the commencement of my own petition is a direct copy, *mutatis mutandis*, except that I do not repeat the word *humbly*—following herein the rule of the House of Lords, that the word *humble*, or *humbly*, be not requisite to be used more than once.

I further find, on reference to an exact verbatim copy of that document, with the signatures, which was not, at first, before me, that the seven bishops concluded their petition by—*not praying* but "most *humbly* and earnestly *beseeching* his Majesty that he will be graciously pleased not to insist upon reading his Majesty's declaration."

If this shows that I have been inaccurate in saying above that in that petition there was no expressed prayer whatever (as there is none in the form in which it is usually exhibited by our historians), that inaccuracy is, I submit, more than compensated by the complete precedent which is thus afforded to me, in all formal particulars, by those illustrious men, one of whom, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, was my predecessor in the See which, by God's permission, I now fill.

THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S AND THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—I request that you will have the goodness to insert in your journal the accompanying copy of a letter addressed by me to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which is published with his Grace's approbation. And I have his permission to add that my letter having only reached him after all the bishops, except the Bishop of Exeter, had given their assent to the address, he thought it too late to make so great an alteration as would have been necessary to meet my objection.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Llanelli, Dec. 12.

C. ST. DAVID'S.

"Abergwili, Carmarthen, Nov. 26.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am sure that you will do me the justice to believe that nothing short of a very deep conviction of a paramount obligation would induce me to take a step so repugnant to my feelings, especially at this juncture, as the withholding my signature from the address proposed by your Grace. In its altered form, it is certainly free from some of the objections which I urged against it before; but it seems to me to have become liable to others, perhaps still graver. The reference to the act of Elizabeth

appears to me in every respect most inadvisable. My own opinion would have been that the provision cited from it has been virtually repealed by the Roman Catholic Relief Act. But at all events the quotation seems to me to prove, if anything, far too much; for the law of Elizabeth has not been violated for the first time by the recent bull. It was equally set at 'defiance' by the appointment of vicars apostolic, who have so long exercised their functions without complaint or molestation; and it seems unreasonable to charge the Pope with 'defying' a law which has been so long permitted to sleep. But a still weightier objection in my mind is, that those who refer in such a manner to the statute of Elizabeth must be considered as expressing a wish to see it again put in force, which it seems to me would involve the repeal of the Relief Act. I cannot consent to make myself responsible for language which, directly or indirectly, indicates such an object; and I would respectfully intreat your Grace to consider whether this part of the address does not admit, if not require, such a construction. There are some others with which, I must own, I am not satisfied, I think it is needlessly harsh, to say the least, to treat the Pope's 'anticipation' of our return to his communion, which he must consider as the greatest of all blessings to us, as 'an unwarrantable insult.' And I am still afraid that the concluding petition, for protection to the labours of the clergy, will be interpreted, not without an appearance of justice, as a wish to see the Roman Catholic proselytisers silenced by Act of Parliament. These last objections, however, I might consent to waive in deference to your Grace's judgment, and for the sake of unanimity; but that which relates to the act of Elizabeth appears to me to involve principles which I may not sacrifice to any other consideration.

"I remain, my dear Lord Archbishop,

"Yours very faithfully,

"The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury."

"C. ST. DAVID'S."

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SECOND LECTURE,

DECEMBER 15, 1850.*

This, my brethren, brings me to the consideration of an important document which has lately appeared, one bearing very much upon what we have been considering; I allude to the address of twenty-eight bishops of the Established Church to the Queen. We may naturally suppose that in a document of such importance every idea was most minutely considered, and every word most deliberately selected; and it seems most strange that between the three different drafts of that address, the first which was sent by the metropolitan to his suffragans, not for consideration but for subscription, and the second and third amended copies, there should be a most extraordinary difference upon a matter on which one would naturally suppose that all the bishops of any Church must think alike. If there is any one point more than another upon which these prelates might be supposed to agree, it is the fundamental and distinctive doctrine of the royal supremacy. Now, at a moment in which, in addresses from bishops to their clergy, from clergy to their flocks, from public men to their constituencies, from Ministers to the nation, we have been charged with violating the Queen's supremacy, we surely have a right to expect a clear, an intelligible definition of that doctrine against which we have so grievously sinned. And now I will read to you the three different forms in which this doctrine is laid down in the three addresses sent to the Bishop of Exeter from Lambeth, to be signed by him. 1. "An unparralleled insult has been offered to your Majesty's prerogative, and to the Church of which your Majesty is the earthly head in this kingdom." No. 2, corrected copy sent from the same to the same. "An unwarrantable insult has been offered to the Church in this kingdom, over which your Majesty's authority is supreme." No. 3, finally published as adopted. "An unwarrantable insult has been offered to the Church and to your Majesty, to whom appertains the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil." First, the Queen is declared to be the head of the Church; next, she is only declared to be its supreme governor; and, thirdly, the whole disappears, and she is only declared to be the ruler, to have chief government of all estates in the realm, be they ecclesiastical or civil: a proposition which, if we understand "government" in its ordinary sense of civil rule, any Catholic may to-day subscribe. You are aware that the Bishop of Exeter not only refused to sign that first declaration, but told the Queen, in a petition addressed to her Majesty, that she was not the head of the Church of England, and even said that such an assumption was contrary to true faith; and yet the title had been bestowed by his own metropolitan. But my motive in calling your attention to this document is in connexion with the statement, that the measure concerning which we are speaking was one that treated

* We content ourselves, on the present occasion, with giving verbatim that portion of the lecture which has reference to the preceding pages.

England with disdain, that it was a national insult, that it was not a Catholic measure, but one intended to act over the whole country. Now, her Majesty is told that England is treated by the Bishop of Rome as having been a heathen land, and is congratulated on its restoration, after an interval of three hundred years, to a place among the Churches of Christendom. I cannot find any expression in the Pope's letter to which these latter words can allude, and therefore I suppose that they refer to the passages which I have already read to you from my own pastoral; and you will recollect that the words were, "Now you will recollect that Catholic England has been restored to its orbit." We have had nothing to say, in treating of the restoration of a Catholic hierarchy, concerning a Church which to us is no Church, and forms no part of the Catholic communion; nor is there any more ground for saying that the Pope has treated England as though it were a heathen land. How could he when he sees it covered with the splendid monuments of Catholic piety and greatness, when he sees everywhere the vestiges of the piety of our ancestors in so many institutions, when he sees and knows, as all the world does, the charity and the zeal which is manifested by people of every rank and of every religion, and even when from so many who, from the ranks of Anglicanism and dissent, daily join his communion, he must have learnt how deep a religious sentiment there is, and how much earnestness there is in the search for truth? And this it is, my brethren, which makes him and me, and every true Catholic pray, that all those who are not in the communion of the Church may be brought speedily with us, and like us, to know her and to love her, and to enjoy peace and consolation as we do within her. As brethren in error indeed, but still as most dear brethren to us, and not as heathens, do we look upon those who are separated from us in faith; and Pius would be unworthy of his high place and of his tender heart were he, on the one hand, to admit any one to communion with the Catholic Church who abjures him and, on the other hand, to cease to pray that all, even these, may soon be brought to the unity of Catholic truth. But, my brethren, although in this extraordinary document there are many things which would call for notice, and which would require a long commentary, there is one particular point to which alone I will confine myself at present, and with which I will conclude—there is one passage in it which I consider it the duty of every Catholic to confute and to repel to the very utmost of his power. It is, indeed, wonderful that when these twenty-eight prelates of the Established Church had to define their own doctrine respecting the royal supremacy, they should so much have varied in the three drafts of the address. But when they have to attack and to vilify the Catholic Church there is a marvellous unanimity in thought and in word, so that scarcely a change is to be found in the three different documents; and the only change that there is, is made for the purpose of marking only more strongly that it refers to our actual present Church. The passage is as follows:—"The return of our people is anticipated to a communion the errors of which they deliberately renounced, and which continues to maintain practices repugnant to God's word, inculcates blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, and prescribes as necessary to salvation the belief of doctrines grounded on no warranty of Scripture." In the original draft the expression, "continues to maintain," did not occur; it was simply stated, that return was anticipated by the people to a communion which they deliberately renounced—renounced because it contained practices repugnant to God's word. It is, therefore, clearly the wish of these twenty-eight bishops of the Church Established, deliberately and solemnly to tell her Majesty that the religion, at this moment, preferred by ten or twelve millions of her faithful subjects consists of practices repugnant to God's word, of "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." This document has not the authority of a synodical act; it was not drawn up in full synod, with every word carefully studied, with invocation of the Holy Spirit, with public supplication, with deep and earnest study; and even though the whole of the bishops of the Establishment had put their hand to it, it would still have been but their individual acts combined. Therefore I must consider it, and deal with it, as simply the declaration of so many theologians of that Church, and as it has not even the *prestige* of unity I must consider it as still more their individual act—that for which they are each one to be held separately responsible. Now, if so, I should be justified in taking the authority of each singly; but, in reality, in acts that are not synodical the amount of weight is only the sum of the respective weights of those who are joined; whereas in a synodical act there is, moreover, impact and force. Here, then, we have twenty-eight divines of the Established Church, twenty-eight men consisting, it is to be presumed, of the best theologians of that Establishment, of the men who, officially at least, form the ecclesiastical council of the nation, those to whom the people naturally look for their faith, we have these twenty-eight men solemnly, and, as far as they can, ecclesiastically, telling the Queen and the whole nation that the religion of their ancestors, of Wykeham and Clicherley, and good Queen Margaret—the founders of those establishments in which they received their education, of establishments founded solely from belief in those very doctrines which they style "blasphemous fables," that that religion was corrupt and erroneous; that the religion of St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis de Sales, of Bossuet, and of Fenelon; that the religion of 160,000,000 Christians, presided over by upwards of 800 bishops, civilised, educated, having their colleges and universities as much as themselves; that the religion of many millions of persons scattered over countries not professedly Catholic; that the religion, in fine, of from ten to twelve millions of the subjects of these realms is nothing less than blasphemy

and deceit—a thing repugnant to God's word! And if this be so, then all these millions are, by this declaration, at once consigned to irrevocable perdition; for to pretend to believe that vast multitudes are saved through practices contrary to God's word, through blasphemy and deceit, would be as sensible and as credible as it would be to tell me that there are populations in some parts of the world which entirely live and thrive upon corrosive sublimate and prussic acid. But this is not all. If this denunciation have any weight, then it follows that we, the Catholic clergy of this country, are professed teachers of blasphemy and deceit; and we—and I personally, not because I have been unworthily placed at the head of that body, but because I am a willing, and a devoted, and, as far as lays in my power, an active promoter of Catholic belief, and because I do so, not in ignorance, but with my eyes and heart full of every doctrine and of every consequence from it—we, I say, have a right to call upon you who differ from us to pause before you give weight to this judgment. Allow me to express what is the value which I attach to it; and remember that these words have not been spoken with any softening or qualification, with any gentle expressions of regret, or with any thought that perhaps we act in ignorance, or that our conduct is better than our theology; no, there is no reserve in this awful denunciation, and, therefore, let me boldly and straightforwardly tell you what I consider to be the value of this theological opinion—what I consider to be the weight and authority of these divines. Then, I say, put together the whole of the published writings of the Anglican bench of bishops, and you will have a most varied collection of learned works. Now, take from them, first, whatever relates to heathen mythology, or to pagan plays, or to Greek and Latin literature; take away from them whatever refers to profane history, to politics, to German romance; take away from them whatever belongs to the province, however excellent, of science, moral or positive; take away whatever is opposed to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration—that is, whatever destroys the very nature of baptism; take away from them whatever impugns sacramentalism in general in the Church of England; take out whatever opposes apostolic succession, the necessity of an episcopate at all; take away from them whatever propagates German Rationalism, or leads covertly to refined infidelity; take away from the collection what is Arian and Sabellian; take away whatever is written expressly against the adorable mystery of the Trinity, against the incarnation of the Son of God, as expressly declared in the Athanasian creed, against all the deeper mysteries of faith; take out of them whatever is asserted by any of these theologians and contradicted as clearly by himself in some other part of his works—in fine, cancel from them whatever any one declares to be the true faith and doctrine of the English Church, and what is as clearly denied to be so and impugned by another, and what will remain will be a nullity. Learning, great and varied, there is, no doubt—in the wisdom of this world no similar body can compete with it—but religion there is none; and how can there be, my brethren, in a system which knows no scientific or regular theology? And we, therefore, will plead an excuse, and we will say what these bishops have said they have said in utter ignorance of what our doctrine is, or what are the motives of it. But, my brethren, what a chasm, what an abyss, does not this declaration make! What a wide and insuperable separation between themselves and that which they are obliged by their own theology to consider, if not the Catholic Church, at least as the aggregate of so many branches of the true Church of Christ! It is impossible to imagine that they can believe that there is any, even however secret, communion existing between themselves and that collection of Churches. It would be contrary to good feeling and to reason to imagine that a Church which considers itself a branch of the true Church holds itself to be in communion likewise with that which teaches only what is repugnant to God's word, “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” One or the other—not both, either they or we alone—can belong to the true Catholic Church of God. Light and darkness, God and Belial, are not more incompatible than that which they have made our Church, and have declared their own to be. Then what was our duty, what was clearly our duty, but to organise ourselves with reference to the nature and the feelings of that Church which recognises us, without reference to an Establishment which, if we were desirous of joining in communion with it, would certainly cast us off with disdain? What, but to become a part of those great and glorious Churches over the whole world in which the true faith has been preserved inviolable, and which looks upon us as a new full-moulded member of the body of Christ, which recognises in us now a full participation of all their privileges, and sees in our poor episcopate and in our afflicted Church only the features of a sister Church—in structure perfect, though still young in growth? And, my brethren, as the ancient Christians built all their basilicas upon one single plan, whether they were immense structures of noble proportions or small and poor, whether it were the Lateran and the Vatican or the way-side church of St. Nereos and Achilleus so does the Church in her moral edifice give to each the same proportions, the same lineaments, the same details. And hence the giving of a hierarchy is not a measure prospective of increase, but it is one of actual necessity or expedience; it is not merely one of outward form, it is a part of its very essence and growth. But, my brethren, one consolation at least, among many, we derive from this our communion with so many Churches over the world under our present circumstances. That communion which holds us together in charity, no less than in faith, is now manifesting itself most gloriously and most consolingly for us, in the abundance of prayers that

are being poured out on every side in our behalf. When addressing you from this very pulpit not many months ago upon what was called "the Gorham question," I remember remarking how unsympathised with the Church of England was, that portion at least which considered itself in conflict with the State, by the rest of Christian Churches. I little thought then that we ourselves should have to put to the proof this mark of active communion. We have done so, my brethren; but oh, with how different a result! On every side, from every part, the same glad tidings come. Every Catholic country is taking the deepest interest in our position, hopes with us, sympathises with us, and, what is far more important, prays for and with us. From the vast multitudes assembled in the magnificent churches of great cities to the scattered populations of country districts; from the bishop of an ancient see to the mountain curate in the neighbouring island, and over the whole Continent, there is a fervour of prayer being put into activity by the knowledge of our position, and the way in which our religion is treated. On every side it is the same voice, "We are praying earnestly for you." And they are strangers, if Catholics can be strangers, that write thus; they are persons whose faces we have never seen. Even in the cloistered retreats of the consecrated virgins, at the doors of which the great events of this world knock in vain for admission, the vibration of our little Church along the golden chords of unity has penetrated even to the silent cell; and the chaste spouses of God are offering up prayers for us, my brethren, in England. Oh, how does this console and encourage us who look upon the work which we are performing as the work of God! How like God's work is this work of prayer! Supplications and addresses to the throne of God instead of to the throne of earthly domination; watching before the altar, instead of Town-hall demonstrations; frequent communion, instead of placards and handbills; adoration before the most Holy, instead of violent outcries and party clamour. Oh! if the bishops in the English Church had come with us into this contest of prayer and spiritual weapons, if they had commanded the whole nation to join in supplication to God, that He would protect His Church in its unity and its purity, oh! then we might indeed have believed that their motives and zeal were more holy and pure than what we have seen can now encourage us to hope. But we, my brethren, we will persevere in our good old way; we will look to God to protect what we know to be His; and as at the commencement of the Church, when Peter was in prison, God inspired the Church to pray incessantly for his deliverance, so likewise may we hope that this communion together in feeling of all Catholic Christendom, which to us is the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is a proof to us that, in like manner, our consolation is at hand.

THE REV. DR. McNEILE.

The dangers of extempore preaching have, perhaps, never been more strikingly apparent than they are from the following fearful sentiments, uttered by one no novice in its use, viz., the Rev. Dr. Hugh McNeile, of Liverpool, a canon of Manchester, and a member of the council, who, under the presidency of Lord Ashley, have assumed the responsibility of reforming the Church, and promoting the (in their minds) purest worship of God. The circumstances are related by the *Liverpool Mercury*, which, after adverting in general terms to the occurrence in question, proceeds:—

"When the circumstance was first told to us we could not and would not believe it; but as it afterwards came to us in substantially the same form from several quarters, we thought it best to make inquiries on the subject, so that, if the story should prove to be unfounded, its circulation might be stopped; and, if not, that the facts might be put forth in an unexaggerated shape.

"This result of our inquiries has been that we have obtained from a highly respectable source as accurate a version of the words used by Dr. McNeile as the memory of our informant enabled him to furnish, and of their substantial accuracy he has no doubt whatever. The extraordinary declaration of sentiment was uttered by the reverend gentleman on Sunday morning last, in the course of his sermon, and is stated to have been to the following effect:— 'I would make it a capital offence to administer the confession in this country. Transportation would not satisfy me, for that would merely transfer the evil from one part of the world to the other. Capital punishment alone would satisfy me. Death alone would prevent the evil. That is my solemn conviction.' The congregation, we have been told, heard the words with mingled sorrow and dread; and, at the close of the service, a representation on the subject was made to Dr. McNeile in the vestry. The reverend gentleman declared, we believe, that he had no consciousness of having made use of such language; but, being assured that he had undoubtedly done so, he expressed his regret in most forcible terms.

"In the course of the evening service the Doctor went into the reading-desk, and, as we are informed, thus addressed his congregation:— 'In the excitement of an extemporaneous address, delivered by me this morning, I used, I believe, a most atrocious expression. That expression I have already withdrawn in the sight of God; I have, I trust, made my peace with Him; and I now beg to withdraw that expression in the sight of this congregation, and to

make my peace with you. I will not repeat the expression which I have referred to, for those who heard it will sufficiently well remember it, whilst I will not grieve (or inflict pain upon) those who did not hear it by repeating it.'

"Dr. McNeile, therefore, bitterly repents of the grave and lamentable error into which he unwittingly fell; but if men of firm mind, of great ability and learning, of long practice in preaching and public speaking, permit so unholy a spirit to enter even for a moment into their souls, and to fashion itself in words, how great must be the charity with which we ought to regard the feelings of those who are destitute of such advantages! . . . Even this most painful incident may be productive of good to England; if, in this sad time of religious ferment, it teach men the necessity of caution and prudence in public-speaking, seeing how easy it is for even a minister of the gospel of peace to be carried away by religious fervour into the enunciation of sentiments so atrocious as the worst that were ever attributed to and condemned in others."

THE REV. DR. McNEILE AND THE ROMISH CONFSSIONAL.

[We willingly fulfil the promise with which a sense of justice led us to accompany our insertion of the communication referred to below by Dr. McNeile; and we accordingly publish the whole of his letter, so far as it relates, directly or indirectly, to the extraordinary transaction detailed by our correspondent "G.," and by our local contemporary the *Liverpool Mercury*. But we do not interpret our pledge to Dr. McNeile as including an undertaking to reprint the declamatory and apocryphal effusions of a deceased pamphleteer against "Popery;" and we must beg to decline that portion of his letter which consists of sundry fabulous-looking "experiences" of a late Mr. Nolan, an ex-"Popish priest." Probably, however, they will not be lost to the public; for Dr. McNeile, with his present notions of Christian duty," will doubtless feel little hesitation in regaling his flock with these or any other incredible horrors which he may deem adapted to promote their growth in holy hatred. As regards the more legitimate object of his communication, there is one rather material point on which he has failed to express himself with the precision and explicitness which the public may naturally have expected. Did he, or did he not, in his address to his congregation during the evening service of Sunday, the 8th instant, characterise the sentiment to which he had given utterance in the morning as an "atrocious" one? It is stated by our correspondent "G.," and also by our local contemporary, that he did; and he does not now contradict this portion of the story, although, from the apologetic and self-justifying tone of his letter, we should infer that his present view of his escapade is far more lenient, and that he merely deplures its "liability to be misunderstood." Will Dr. McNeile be good enough to inform us whether he did thus designate the worse than unfortunate outburst in question, and, if he did, will he explain the sudden and rapid fluctuation in his moral estimates of his own conduct as a Christian clergyman? In the mean time, he must excuse us for saying that we consider that the language in which he is reported to have conveyed his retraction of the sentiment in question was decidedly creditable to him, and that it marked, with singular force and truth, the real character of that fanatical outburst.—*Morning Chronicle*, Dec. 19, 1850.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

Sir—I do not often see your paper, and since I saw the impression of last Friday I have been incessantly occupied. With your readiness to publish a statement to my prejudice, without any inquiry into its accuracy, I appreciate the courtesy which induced you to offer to publish my reply. It will be an act of justice, in which a free press should delight, for all the journals which have reprinted your statement to give insertion to this letter. Without further preface, I will state facts.

On Sunday morning, the 8th inst., I preached a sermon on the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor., iv., 5—"Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come," &c. &c. I showed, from the context, that the things referred to were the hidden things of man's heart, in reference to which no man should attempt to judge his fellow man; and distinguished them from outward actions, which are to be, and must be, judged by man; pointing out the appropriate tribunal which God has appointed for each of these judgments—the civil magistrates from day to day for the one; our Lord Jesus Christ, in the day of his coming, for the other.

Enlarging on the Christian duty of not judging the secret things of the heart "before the time," I contrasted with it the anti-Christian practice of the confessional, in which the Romish priest institutes inquiry into the secrets of men for the express purpose of pronouncing judgment. I showed that, according to their system, the priest stands there as God, and that it is mortal sin to conceal anything from him. All is told, and he appoints what he judges a suitable and adequate penance. The penance being performed, the affairs of the penitent's soul are considered as settled up to that date. He is distinctly told that the absolution given him is judicial, and that what the priest thus declares on earth God ratifies in heaven. The penitent

is relieved from the working of an accusing conscience, and society defrauded of the benefit which would have resulted from an open confession.

This led to a statement of the secrecy of the Romish confessional, on which I quoted thus from the evidence of Doctors Doyle and Magaurin (Roman Catholic bishops), before a committee of the House of Lords, in 1825.

RIGHT REV. J. DOYLE, D.D.

"Would a priest think himself justified, in case he received in confession a knowledge of an intended crime, to take any measure by which he could prevent the execution of that crime?—No; he cannot; more than the means he uses with the individuals themselves.

"Could he not warn the person against whom the crime is intended to be committed?—He cannot."

RIGHT REV. JAMES MAGAURIN, D.D.

"Are not the parties who commit a murder generally known to the priest?—I do not think they are.

"Supposing it were stated to him in confession, would the priest think it consistent with his duty to divulge any part of a communication which was made to him in confession?—I do not think he would.

"Might he not disclose so much of it as would prevent the perpetration of the crime, without committing the person who has made the confession?—He could not divulge any part of it."

Commenting upon all this, I said, that whatever fiction might be in the priest's mind concerning his Church and her authority, he was, in the eye of the law of both God and man, as guilty of the murder in such a case as the deluded wretch who actually committed it, and no punishment could be too severe for him—no, not even capital punishment. I had no sooner uttered this expression, than I felt it would be taken out of its context and misunderstood, and I immediately made an attempt to modify it. In this I did not succeed. I felt at the moment that I had not expressed myself clearly, and I do not wonder that I was misunderstood.

Under ordinary circumstances I would have taken no further notice of the affair in public. But the circumstances of Liverpool at the time were peculiar. We had just had a town's meeting convened by the Mayor, to address her Majesty on the subject of the Papal bull recently published. At that meeting several Roman Catholic priests appeared, and an attempt was made to create disturbance, and defeat the object of the meeting. It had been my privilege to resist that attempt, and, when it failed, to address the meeting at some length. The excitement occasioned by this in the town had not subsided. I was engaged and advertised to deliver a lecture on the Papal canon law on the 10th, and some anxiety was felt lest further disturbance should arise. My apprehension was that the expression I had made use of, as above described, would be seized upon and turned to account to aggravate the feeling already excited against me in the Papal party in the town. I determined, therefore, to disarm hostility, as far as I could, by candidly expressing in the evening the regret which I sincerely felt at having used a phrase in the pulpit so liable to misconception. I was not to preach in the evening, and, therefore, after the second Lesson, I said a few words from the reading-desk, avowing my regret for having used an expression in my sermon in the morning, which a moment's reflection would have caused me to avoid, as palpably liable to be misunderstood: that I had realised this regret secretly before God, and expressed it honestly before them.

These are the facts of the case. And now, sir, permit me to add, that it is not a fact that any peculiar sensation was manifested in my congregation in the morning; that it is not a fact that any remonstrance of any kind was addressed to me by any member or members of the congregation after the service; that it is not a fact that I ever said I had no consciousness of having used the language in question. I knew, and know, perfectly, what I had said. One gentleman of the congregation wrote me a note, not of remonstrance, but of kind inquiry, to ascertain whether he had understood me aright. His note was brought into the vestry before the evening service, just as we were leaving the vestry to go into the church, and not read till after the service.

I do not feel called upon to make any comments in self-defence upon all this. I understand full well the ordeal to which every man must be exposed who adopts consistently the tone which, for many years, I have felt it a Christian duty to adopt. I have counted the cost, and make no complaint. It is, however, right that exaggeration and misrepresentation should be met by facts.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

HUGH MPNEILE.

London, December 17.

[The editor cannot refrain from stating that his own personal experience of the reverend gentleman, over a period of thirty years, justifies him in asserting that in all controversial discussions, whether religious or political, he has always been too prone to forget that he is a minister of the gospel of "peace and good will towards men." It may seem ungenerous to doubt the sincerity of his present recantation; but when the editor sees that a

few days after this denunciation was uttered, the reverend doctor gave vent to the following proposition on the platform of Exeter Hall, it is enough to enforce doubts :—

“1st. That the English people should demand of the Government that the College of Maynooth should be disendowed, and that all national assistance to the Catholic religion (out of the national funds), either at home or in the colonies, should be withdrawn.

“2nd. That they should demand an enactment, that the total abjuration of Popery should be a *sine qua non* for the holding of offices of trust and power of any description under the Sovereign of England.”

Now, it is a practical question for the consideration of thoughtful men—Do these enunciations accord with the benign principles of the Christian religion of which the Rev. Dr. McNeile is an acknowledged teacher? It must be borne in mind also that Roman Catholics form a third of the total of her Majesty's subjects; that they pay (perhaps more willingly than most of those who dissent from the Established Church) a large aggregate annual sum in the form of tithes, Church and other ecclesiastical rates, and yet, forsooth, the pittance they receive is to be withdrawn, and even their civil privileges and rights as members of this great nation are to be put in jeopardy or withdrawn! As just and generous Protestants, we should endeavour in all these agitating discussions to look at both sides of the question.]

THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

The Bishop of Norwich has answered at length an address from some eight hundred of his clergy on the Roman measures, which, from its excessive liberality in tone, has excited much comment. His lordship thinks the Pope's bull in itself would deserve contempt and nothing more—would be as sheer folly as would be a similar attempt on behalf of his faith by the Patriarch of the Greek Church or the grand Mufti of Mahomedanism; but the fact that the nation was once Roman in its doctrines, practices, and government, with some contemporaneous circumstances, give the proceeding significance. Of the circumstances thus alluded to, the bishop ranks as foremost in its importance, the strength of the Romish Church in Ireland and the influence which its strong position there necessarily has on the whole of the United Kingdom :—

“Six millions of our fellow-subjects in Ireland are Romanists. They exercise their religion there under a Church organisation as complete, and as openly displayed, as that which exists in the Papal States, and with a submission to its authority which certainly cannot be exceeded in the Pope's own dominions. Their bishops, moreover, assume the same ancient titles as ours; and their dioceses and their parishes are the same, or nearly so. Open a Dublin directory, and you will find a table of the Romish Church establishment side by side with that of ours—clergy list, dioceses, parishes, religious orders, convents, sisterhoods. Ireland, recollect, is not an independent country in alliance with England, nor is it a dependency of England; it is an integral part of the United Kingdom. Not only is the British Legislature composed of its noblemen and commoners indifferently with those of England and Scotland, and without reference to religious creed, but it has been long our progressive policy to remove and obliterate every distinction which may give even the appearance of its people being other than one people with us. The condition of the Romish Church in Ireland becomes thus the foundation of a claim that that Church should be put on the same footing in England. Its strength in one part of the United Kingdom communicates strength to it in every other part. If we speak of the small proportion which the English Romanists bear to the rest of the people of England, they remind us that they are a fourth of the aggregate population of the United Kingdom. It was to be expected that, sooner or later, an attempt would be made to give to their Church in England the regular and complete form, and, if possible, the status and influence which it has so long had in Ireland. The measure has been in contemplation for some years. They tell us so.”

To the immense immigration of Irish labourers a considerable influence on the minds of the English priesthood must also be attributed. Of one other cause he can only speak in sorrow :—

“Conversions from our communion, during some years past, have, we cannot doubt, had their influence in encouraging the present aggression on us. When the Pope's bull, apparently in allusion to this circumstance, speaks of the ‘very large and everywhere increasing number of Catholics’ in this country, the statement is an exaggeration. The total number of converts from us to Rome is not, I apprehend, very large; but that they should have excited great expectations in Rome was not unnatural. When fragments, however small, of our holy edifice were seen continually falling away, it was not unreasonable to conclude that that portion of the building to which they had previously adhered was likewise unsound and ready to break away too—and that these were symptoms of a wide-spreading decay which would make its overthrow certain and easy. The events of the last few weeks have dissi-

pated this delusion—at all events, so far as regards the notion that Romanism had taken any deep or extensive hold of the Church of England. At the same time, what has happened may well awake us all to the ruinous tendency of that movement which has been too long going on and gathering strength within the bosom of our Church—which has created disunion amongst us amounting almost to schism—has in too many instances converted the filial attachment which is due to the Church of England from its members into vague aspirations after Catholicity, or some ideal standard of purity and perfection; and, in pursuit of these objects, has introduced changes in our Church services, whether revivals or novelties, and a tone of teaching, which have created an impression that there is a growing disposition to retrace the course on which we entered at the Reformation. I hope and believe that the warning which we have now had will prove an effectual check to all this; but, if it be otherwise—if the display of the Romish Church amongst us in fuller organisation than heretofore should even be the means of alluring greater numbers to that communion, I cannot bring myself to think that the numbers will ever be so great as to give a preponderating influence to Romanism in this country. Our general character as a people, our English habits of thinking and acting, are opposed to the genius of Romanism. There is an antagonistic principle in our civil institutions and in our routine of social and domestic life which forbids it. Danger there may be to this or that individual or family—increased danger, perhaps. Let us all be on our guard. But it would be absurd and weak to believe that the nation's Protestantism, or the Protestantism of the national Church, is in jeopardy. Englishmen must undergo other changes before this, or simultaneously with this, which would leave us the same people in little more than name."

Apart from its insulting manner, the measure itself is nothing of which we have any right to complain consistently with our toleration of Romanism:—

"We may justly look with mistrust and suspicion on an ecclesiastical arrangement for the Romish Church which can only be adapted to a vast increase of its members, and on the assumption of episcopal titles which suggest a rivalling or superseding of those borne by the Bishops of the Church of England. We may reasonably protest against this new ecclesiastical establishment being presided over by a Cardinal Archbishop, because, as Cardinal, he is, at the same time, a state counsellor to a foreign potentate. But an Episcopal Church is not tolerated if we interfere with its liberty to appoint bishops, to determine its number and rank, and to bestow on them any title, provided those titles infringe on no existing rights.

"It is above all important not to be led away by the startling effect of what is new in this movement, from contemplating that which is no novelty, but which is only more prominently brought under notice by it—the one great feature that the arrangement is made in England by a foreign power. Such a social organisation is, within an indefinite range of action, irresponsible to any power in the kingdom. If the head of the Church of Rome were the temporal subject of another State, any question of his interference in the temporal affairs of this country might be made a subject of reference or renonstrance from the Government of this country to that of which the Pope was a subject: but the circumstance of his being at once a spiritual and a temporal sovereign makes him in every such instance judge in his own case. It is idle with respect to an authority so constituted, to speak of its being limited in its exercise to religious affairs; and a reference to the earlier periods of our own history, to the history of other nations, and to what is taking place in Ireland at this moment in reference to education, shows this. The inconvenience and mischief attendant on this *imperium in imperio* have been felt alike in Roman Catholic and in Protestant countries, and in recent times the security of the system of concordats has been adopted: but England has rejected this mode, and adopted that of renouncing all official intercourse."

The Bishop completes his remarkson the political aspect of the question with counsel to his clergy to lay before the Sovereign their assurances of their cordial support "in the vindication of her rights, and of the Protestant character of the country, whether from actual aggression or insult."

On the religious branch of the subject he advises them:—

"The occasion is one which should rouse the clergy generally to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the questions between the Church of Rome and ourselves; and, wherever and whenever it may be needed, to make their flock familiar with them too. Do not misunderstand me. Controversy I dread. It is one of the evils which we have to guard against, if this rival Church should ever erect itself, side by side with ours, throughout England. Avoid the bitterness of controversy. Avoid its uncaring excitement. Still, it will be your duty, in those parishes where there is any Roman Catholic ministrations and teaching, to give such instruction as may enable your flocks to resist the fallacies by which the Romish Church seeks to gain ascent even to its most corrupt and unscriptural doctrine; especially the assertion that theirs is the old Church, ours the innovation; that they possess an infallible guide to God's truth, because they pretend to it; and that the erection of a central supremacy at Rome or elsewhere was enjoined and sanctioned by the Lord Jesus or his Apostles. I should

neglect, however, the most important advice which it is my duty to offer if I said this much and no more. The fundamental distinction between the Church of Rome and the Church of England is not difference in doctrine and practice, however momentous, but difference as to the source to which they ultimately appeal for the truth of their respective doctrines, and the correctness of their respective practices. The master question which rules all else is, whether we are bound as Christians, and believers in Christian revelation, to bring our creed ultimately, in every article of it, to the test of Scripture, which they as well as we acknowledge to be inspired of God; or to bring even the meaning of Scripture itself to the test of human authority, which they do not presume to call inspired, but for which they claim an unerring wisdom that implies inspiration. It is this difference between them and us in respect of the standard of Divine truth, and in the tone of teaching which results from looking at the one or to the other standard, that the occasion calls on us to maintain. Avoid even the appearance of concession in respect of this. Avoid all that may give your flocks the impression that there is any co-ordinate with that of the scriptural word of God. Seek not only the instruction which you give them, but the tone and spirit of that instruction from Scripture; remembering that that only is God's word—that that alone is 'the sword of the spirit.' May He give you grace and power to wield it, and may He make it effectual, still and for ever, for preserving amongst us 'the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.'"

EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

To the Most Reverend the Archbishops, and the Right Reverend the Bishops, of the United Church of England and Ireland.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIPS,—Whereas the Universal Church, in the Eighth Canon of the Third General Council held at Ephesus, A.D. 431, has declared, that "none of the most religious bishops shall invade any other province, which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hand of himself or his predecessors. But if any one has so invaded a province, and brought it by force under himself, he shall restore it, that the canons of the fathers be not transgressed, nor the pride of secular dominion be privily introduced under the appearance of a sacred office, nor we lose by little the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by his own blood."

And whereas the said synod has also decreed in the said canon, that "the rights, which have heretofore, and from the beginning, belonged to each province, shall be preserved to it pure and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old."

And whereas it is notorious, that, at the time when the said Council was held, *the Bishop of Rome had no jurisdiction in the realm of England:*

And whereas the said Bishop of Rome, in a Bull dated the 24th day of September, 1850, has pretended to erect the said realm of England into an archbishopric of Westminster; and to divide the said pretended archbishopric into twelve bishoprics; and to commit to the said pretended archbishop and bishops the cure of souls within the realm of England:

We, therefore, the undersigned clergy, churchwardens, and members of St. John's Church, Anderson, in the City of Glasgow, do hereby declare the decrees of the said Papal Bull to be an unquestionable breach of the 8th Canon of the Council of Ephesus, which all Christians are bound to obey; and a decided invasion of the rights of the Church of England, as guaranteed by the said Council, and therefore to be utterly void and of none effect, and consider it our duty to make public a declaration of our sympathy with our brethren of the Church of England, in those feelings of indignation and grief which must be occasioned by the recent attempt to supersede the existing Episcopate of England:

And we do further declare, that the actual bishops of the Church of England are the only canonical successors of the apostles in that kingdom, and that, consequently, they, and they only, are entitled to the spiritual allegiance of all Englishmen.

Our own position, indeed, is different from that of the Church of England. The Pope has not hitherto extended his measure to this country; and we are members of a Church which, though in full communion with the Church of England and Ireland, is unendowed and unestablished. We know not, however, how soon a similar attempt may be made in Scotland, which, while repugnant to the principles and feelings of her Majesty's presbyterian subjects, would be no less regarded by ourselves as dangerous to Christian faith, and as an invasion of the ecclesiastical rights of our own episcopate; and we feel it a duty to declare our readiness to co-operate with our brethren of the Church of England in resisting an aggression which we believe to be insulting to the due supremacy of the British Crown, subversive of the principles of ecclesiastical order, and calculated to injure the purity of Christian faith, by encouraging the hopes of the Church of Rome, and by placing its pretensions in such a point of view as

is likely to dazzle the imagination of weak and unstable minds. We are satisfied that this act is contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter even, of existing statutes of the realm. The oath of supremacy was framed expressly to prevent aggressions of this kind; and this invasion of the rights of the English Sovereign, and English episcopate, is utterly inconsistent with the pledges and promises held forth by the Roman Catholics at the time when the disabilities of which they complained were removed.

It seems that the supporters of this arrogant assumption have attempted to justify it, by the example of this Church, in ascribing to its prelates an ecclesiastical superintendance over the ancient dioceses of the Episcopal Church, when established by law in Scotland. The analogy will not bear a moment's examination; but it may be well, on this occasion, to state that this Church is—

1. In full communion with the Church of England, from which it derives its Orders and Liturgy, and which we have ever regarded with affectionate reverence, as the lawful representative, in England, of the Catholic Church of Christ, and the source of numberless blessings to all parts of the British Empire.

2. It is a Church which, while it claims, indeed, an origin which no earthly government could give, rejoices also to remember that it is in express terms protected, and allowed by the law of the land. (3 and 4 Vic. c. 33.) Its line of bishops is recognised by law. Its clergy, before admitted to Holy Orders, are required to take a form of the Oath of Supremacy, suited to our ecclesiastical position, by which they declare that “no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any power, pre-eminence, superiority, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.” They subscribe the thirty-nine Articles of Religion, equally with the clergy of the Church of England, and, under due ecclesiastical licence, are admissible to officiate in the churches and chapels within the mission and jurisdiction of the English Church.

We are confident that the members of this Church yield to no class of her Majesty's subjects in a determination to uphold, at all times, the rights of the British Crown, against this insolent invasion on the part of a foreign potentate, as well as to contend for that pure and scriptural faith which is embodied in the Liturgy and Articles of our Church, and which, we believe, the encroachments of the Church of Rome are likely, in too many instances, to undermine.

We are very sensible that the Church of which we are members is a humble branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, and our own congregation of no great note or number; but, considering that, at this time, it is important that all earnest-minded Christians should unite in an expression of feeling and principle, we are anxious to make public the present declaration of our honest and hearty opinion in this emergency.

We have the honour to be, my Lords, your most faithful servants,

ALEX. J. D. D'ORSEY, Incumbent.

JOHN TAYLOR, M.A., Curate.

(Signed)

D. M. DEWAR,

WILL. BOYD.

} Churchwardens.

Glasgow, December 6, 1850.

(REPLY.)

Edinburgh, Dec. 12.

REVEREND SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the address which you have forwarded to me from the officers and congregation of your church, and I fully concur with the subscribers in the opinion they express, that the attempt to justify the recent aggression of the Pope by the analogy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland only proves the absence of any true precedent or warrant for such an usurpation of power.

I remain, Reverend Sir, your faithful servant,

J. B. CANTUAR.

The Rev. Alex. J. D. D'Orsey.

The FOURTEENTH SERIES will contain some very important documents.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE CHURCH, THE STATE, AND THE PEOPLE;
 SPEECH OF SIR EDWARD SUGDEN AT THE SURREY
 COUNTY MEETING AT EPSOM;
 CARDINAL WISEMAN, DR. CUMMING, AND
 MR. BOWYER;
 THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD & THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE
 MR. MOLYNEUX TAYLOR; AND
 A FEW MORE WORDS TO ENGLISHMEN OF ALL PERSUASIONS.

THE CHURCH, THE STATE, AND THE PEOPLE.

"The Church is in danger—to the rescue!" is and has been now for some time the popular cry; bishops and deans, rectors and curates, statesmen and commoners have with one consent raised the universal shout. Sermons and speeches, pamphlets and addresses have emanated from all quarters and without number. All have rushed together as a great mob, to drive Popery from the kingdom; and as with all other mobs, the amount of evil there is being done will by far exceed the good. The more reflecting part of the community watch with anxiety the course of events. They are not alarmed for their religion, nor is there cause for alarm; as the following simple anecdote may serve to illustrate. There are certain emissaries of Rome in almost every town in England; and one of these, quartered at Bath, with more zeal, perhaps, than prudence in his endeavours "to make proselytes," met an artisan; and scarcely finding a willing ear to his arguments, taunted him with the present instability of our Church; saying that ere long there would be "a great battle in England, when your faith will go to the winds, and the religion of the Pope supplant it." "I tell ye what it is," replied the worthy artisan; "it may be so, sir, but Heaven has given me, and thousands like me, good brawny limbs, and you Popish vagabonds *should have a taste of them, take my word for it.*" It is notorious that among the intelligent artisans and mechanics in England, the ministers of Popery have less influence than over any other class.

It is not, then, our *religion* that is in danger, but that the great dignitaries of our *Church* tremble lest the fabric now beset with storm and tempest, tottering from its base, should fall and crush them, or rather dissolve itself into a multitude of streams, spreading that which is concentrated in the hands of a few unworthy members among a host of zealous and indefatigable men whose hearts are centered in their religion, and who struggle manfully for the eternal welfare of their fellow-man.

That the bishops and all holders of fat livings should tremble for their security is no marvel. The present age perceives abuses and *will* have them remedied. They read of the simplicity and purity of our early Church, of the religion and example set to ministers of the same by the apostles, and compare it with our own *Church*, the comparison showing a thing ugly and deformed. History informs us of the primitive Christians, "that before the end of the first century they established among themselves certain laws for the government of their Church, and elected bishops; but whose limited jurisdiction was the administration of the sacraments, and discipline of the Church, the superintendancy of religious ceremonies, the consecration of ecclesiastical ministers, to whom the bishops assigned their respective functions, and the management of the public fund. These powers, during a short period, were exercised according to the advice of the presbyterial college, and with the consent and approbation of the assembly of Christians. The primitive bishops were considered only as the first of their equals, and the honorable servants of a free people. Whenever the episcopal chair became vacant by death, a new president was chosen among the presbyters by the suffrage of the whole congregation."

From this extract, it is evident that we can see now but the shadow of that great principle of

charity and brotherly love among the clergy—that the *Church* is void of that simplicity and beauty which was left by the apostles. It is true that, shortly after the period named, a variety of new forms and ceremonies, succeeded by superstition and idolatry, crept into the Church, and formed by degrees that monster of iniquity which proclaims itself infallible. That a mother Church so pure should produce such unworthy progeny is lamentable; but if we examine her history, we shall see that the curse of opulence and grandeur, of ambition and avarice, has been the primary cause of her abasement in the Romish Church; we shall also see how far our own has been corrupted by it.

As the influences of Christianity spread, and as the revenues of the Church increased, a rivalry for precedence sprung up among bishops, who began to assume a lordly power and authority which they had not hitherto possessed. The community whom it was their interest to convert were principally pagans, and, in order to make their religion less repugnant to these idolaters, they introduced pictures into their churches, to which were shortly after added images; and it is a known fact that there are some still at Rome, that have been worshipped as Jupiter and Venus, that are now venerated as St. Paul and the Virgin. These innovations were made to gain strength, to increase their numbers. With this sacrifice of principle the Church grew in its enormity, until even the depths of superstition and the arts of a cunning priesthood could not avail to close the eyes of men to the abomination that was set up before them: and hence the Reformation.

By this act, it was intended to lead men's minds back to the early era of which we have spoken. It was a revolution wonderful and astounding; but that a perfect Church should be raised from the ashes that had been for so many ages all but extinguished, should have been pressed into life and vigour, free and uncontaminated by its pollution, was, in the hands of man, impossible. Great as the Reformation was, inestimable as have been its benefits, there still exist remnants of Romish evils which, though not generally used, are openly tolerated; even in our ritual there are certain forms which, though now become effete, are sought to be revived by those who would go hand-in-hand with Rome, or merge into her bosom, rather than raise their Church to that bright example of purity which alone entitles her to the name of Christian. But let us calmly look at the state of the Church at the present time. We have bishops and archbishops, deans and sub-deans, chancellors and precentors, elevated by rank and title, the grand struggle among them being, not for which shall do most good for the religion of which they are the nominal heads, but for who shall be *greatest*, and for who shall enjoy the best gifts, for who shall live in the most princely and most magnificent style, forgetting the words of their Divine Master, who said, "He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? But I am among you as he that serveth." An wholesome lesson, on which two constructions cannot be put. But if our bishops and pastors believe the Bible from which they teach and preach, what answer can they make to this falling off from the word? They profess to be the successors of the Apostles, but we can find no record of St. Paul or St. Peter having required to be housed in splendid palaces, to be clothed in fine linen, and to have fared sumptuously every day. Their mission was to seek and to save; but the bishops of our day are above such low occupations, and leave to Sunday-school teachers and zealous members of the laity to work that spiritual good which our Saviour and his Apostles by their *example* set forth.

It is clear that, if we take the Bible for our guide, these over-fed dignitaries usurp the rights of their poorer brethren, and consequently rob the laity of that means of spiritual instruction which has been, from time to time, provided, not to exalt the few by crowning

* It is undeniable that great abuses exist in the management of the ecclesiastical property; that the incomes of the high dignitaries of our Church far exceed in amount those of any other Christian nation. The highest dignity of the Church in France, the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, has, I believe, only 2,000*l.* a-year and a residence; the suffragan bishops have incomes varying from 500*l.* to 1,000*l.* a-year. The highest ecclesiastical dignity in Prussia, the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne, has only 2,000*l.* a-year and a residence; but, by a Parliamentary paper (No. 543, Session 1845, and reprinted last Session as No. 310), it appears that for seven years, ending the 31st of December, 1843, the total gross income of twenty-five archbishops and bishops of England and Wales amounted to no less a sum than *one million four hundred and eleven thousand six hundred and sixty-nine pounds one shilling* (1,411,669*l.* 1*s.*), whilst their net income was one million one hundred and twenty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five pounds nine shillings and twopence (1,121,485*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*). The income of the bishopric of Lichfield is not included, as it appears the agent of the bishop had absconded, so that no return could be made. But no account has ever been rendered of the items comprised in the large sum of two hundred and ninety thousand one hundred and eighty-three pounds eleven shillings and twopence (290,183*l.* 11*s.* 10*d.*), which constitutes the difference between gross and net income. . . . In addition, and within a very few years, 60,000*l.* has been expended on the palace at Lambeth, and 143,044*l.* on the episcopal residences and demesnes of eight dioceses only, whilst in those eight dioceses only 5,259*l.* could be found for the benefit of the working clergy by the augmentation of small livings, in which eight sees there are *eighty-five livings under fifty pounds a-year, and 417 livings between fifty and one hundred pounds a year!*—*Vide Sir B. Hall's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

them with kingly incomes, but that the poor may be fed and their spiritual wants watched over and supplied. There is no precedent in the Bible, there is no justice in their cause, there is not even the shadow of State policy to justify these spiritual great men in grasping such enormous wealth, which should be devoted to the benefit of the people by a diffusion of spiritual knowledge.

But while descanting on the subject of fat bishoprics and over-grown livings, let us not lose sight of those humbler advocates of the Church, those real workers in the hive, the curates. It is notorious that there are thousands who are paid worse than almost any skilful mechanic, and many, very many, who do not receive as much as the wages of a policeman. These men, too, are those who brave the fever and pestilence, who enter the loathed alleys and crowded dwellings of the poor, ministering the gospel of peace, alleviating distress even out of their scanty pittances, softening the pillow of the wretched, and comforting the last moments of the dying.* What bishop or high dignitary is there that stoops so low? Is such an amazing disproportion to remain? Are not these evils, *abuses*, to be remedied?

We of the laity, knowing of these overpaid ecclesiastics, cannot cease to wonder why it is that at every chance we should be taxed from the cradle to the grave for services that are already paid for. When a child is taken to the church to be baptised, a *fee* is demanded—small, they will say, it is true; but, though small, it is the cause of thousands not having that sacrament administered to them; as a proof of which, several ministers of different parishes announced, at Whitsuntide last, that on Whitsunday children brought to the church then would be baptised *free*; there were nearly one hundred availed themselves of it at each church, showing the willingness of the poor to bring their children to the faith of the Church of England, if they can do so without being mulcted of a *fee*. At marriages, too, we must needs go with money in our pockets; the solemn contract which is to be blessed by the minister of God must be *paid* for. The last sad office of burial, too, cannot be administered without the wretched widow and helpless orphan, rendered perhaps destitute by a lingering sickness, even this cannot be done without a *fee*. Yes, the well-fed parson lives by such misery as this; either they must pawn their scanty furniture, or sell the bed on which is stretched the corpse of him who was their support, or go to the parish and have a pauper funeral, a degradation from which their honest industry had before kept them aloof. In marriages and deaths the fees are not so small, being less optional; they are ceremonies that must be performed, and hence there is less scruple in demanding to have them paid for. Why is this, that, in addition to well-paid benefices, in these necessary offices a *fee* should be extorted? Is it to increase the emoluments of the poor curate who usually does the work? If so, we can hardly wish to wring it from him, but we fear not; all these chances of mortality are reckoned with the value of the living, and swell the delicacies of the rich man's table.

Let us now glance at the government of the Church within itself. We understand the office of the bishop is to prevent any holding heretical doctrine entering the Church, or, being within its fold, to teach aught that is inconsistent with her Articles and the true faith of a Christian. Yet we know and are witnesses of some of her ministers openly practising certain mummeries that savour more of a pantomime than of religious worship. They have their bowings and crossings, their confessions and penance, their hearts and their service being devoted to the Church of Rome whilst getting silly Protestants to fill their purses. These renegades are tolerated, yea encouraged, by the pusillanimity of a bishop whose authority and power they set at defiance. What security is there for a Church that possesses a pillar so weak and incapable?

Nor is this the only weak point in Church government. One half of the clergy believe the other half heretical, because of a difference of construction of a word in the Articles. It seems the *spirit* of our faith and profession is but of secondary importance; bishops squabble about the *letter*, and, while doing so, expose their weakness and frailty to their fellow-men, creating uncomfortable doubts that are uncalled for, and leaving them in ignorance and dissatisfied. Are not such courses as these opening the very doors, that Popery or any other wolf may enter and destroy the flock? Can Rome's Cardinal look on and see such clerical dissension without a latent hope that he can make converts to his Church? Does he not artfully point to our spiritual teachers, and say, Can such be of the true Christian Church? Again, how many of the clergy of the Church of England fulfil their duties as they ought? We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that there are numbers of our churches so thinly attended that the

* If the incomes of the two archbishops were reduced to 6,000*l.* a year each, and 50,000*l.* a year was assigned as an income between the other twenty-three bishops, there would by this reduction alone be at once an annual surplus fund of 139,667*l.*, which would provide 698 clergymen with salaries of 200*l.* a-year each. We have also a case before us of an archdeacon in this diocese of London enjoying four pieces of preferment, amounting to at least 5,300*l.* a year, besides three or four houses, to all of which he has been appointed *within the last ten years*. There is another archdeacon who has 6,200*l.* a year; and if the incomes of these two archdeacons were reduced to 1,000*l.* a year each, there would be a surplus from these two pluralists alone of no less than 9,500*l.* a year, which would be sufficient to supply incomes of 200*l.* a-year each for forty-seven more additional pastors from these two sources of reduction alone.—*Vide Sir B. Hall's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

officials employed form as many as one-fourth of the congregation;* and there are others, although better attended, and doubtless by individuals anxiously seeking for instruction and guidance, for counsel and advice, but whose pastor, either from want of zeal or ability, from carelessness or a lack of knowledge to expound the doctrines of our faith, suffer them to pass into that state of apathy and indifference which is inconsistent with true religion. And as they perceive the more zealous efforts of other sects, or become assailed by Roman Catholic partisans, they feel that to be religious they must be zealous; and seeing the more stirring interest taken by the members of the Romish faith, they are, step by step, led on until they become converts to that Church. Hence it is that we hear of many, particularly young females, having left the Church of England. Preaching, to be of any benefit, must be something more than the getting through a certain number of words in a given time. The schoolboy monotony of tone is not calculated to impress the hearer; the invariable moral lecture of the distinctive opposites of virtue and vice becomes irksome and uninteresting. We look upon preaching as a means for the exposition of our faith, that men may know what they believe, that they may have practical information and sound logical reasoning on certain passages of the Bible, which perhaps may occur in the day's lessons, that affect their consciences, and may allay their doubts, that they may be prepared with weapons to resist the attacks of the sophist, the infidel, or the Jesuit.

What is it that makes the service so wearisome, that while some are nodding in their pews; others' thoughts are wandering to their business, their anticipated pleasures, or their domestic troubles? The beauty of the composition is inspiring and sublime, applicable to all sorts and conditions of men, comforting to the afflicted, and breathing a spirit of kindly welcome to the sinner. Why, then, is it used with so little effect? It is the bare fact, that those whose duty it is to conduct the service, do so with so little feeling, so devoid of energy or solemn appeal, without emphasis, and consequently without meaning. Feeling nothing themselves, they rather are an interruption to the devotion of Christians than otherwise. What a marked difference is there when the service is read as it ought to be! There are some congregations who are so fortunate as to have ministers impressed with the sacredness and importance of their office, that are not puffed up withal. Popular amongst them, and deservedly receiving the highest respect and praise, they are courteous and benignant to their pew-sitters, kind and affectionate to the free-sitters, showing by their private example and lives that they glory only in the cross and not on their own merits.

But justice demands another word for those of the clergy whose immoral lives are a scandal to all society. There are those who are drunkards, profligates, and debauchees, whose only respect for the Church is, that it supplies them with the means of eking out their miserable lives. We have heard of one, who, boasting over his cups amongst companions of the same kidney, asserted that he had been drunk the last three days of the week. "Oh!" said one in derision, "what would your congregation say to that?" "Say?" said he, "for the matter of that, I will tell them of it to-morrow in the pulpit." "I'll bet you so much you won't dare to do it." "Agreed," said the parson; and so the matter rested. The next day, after giving out his text, he said, "Thursday I was drunk, Friday I was drunk, Saturday I was drunk;" and paused; he then added, "So says the drunkard"—and went on to preach against a vice that he was getting notorious for encouraging in himself. Have the laity, then, to dread the approach of Rome, or is it the clergy?

We have much reason to complain of their want of zeal, piety, and sociability. Their visits to the poor and wretched are only found in isolated cases; the middle classes are utterly disregarded. It should not be so. A minister of the Gospel should, by his *example*, show how to act up to the spirit of the Bible by a friendly communion with his congregation; by so doing he would be beloved as well as respected. But there is too much lukewarmness amongst them; there is neither energy in their discourses, piety in their lives, nor religious sociability in their customs. They would do well to remember the teaching of Bishop Latimer, who told his clergy that "the most diligent prelate and preacher in all England is the Devil: he is never out of his diocese, he is never from his cure; he is ever in his parish: there was never such a preacher in England as he. In the mean time, the prelates take their pleasure; they are lords and no labourers: therefore, ye unpreaching prelates, learn of the devil to be diligent in your office; learn of the Devil, if ye will not learn of God and good men; learn of the Devil I say." (Plough sermon, 1548.) Such plain terms are perhaps unsuitable at the present day; nevertheless the advice is equally applicable and as necessary as in the sixteenth century.

That the power of creating bishops and bishoprics is solely with the State is questionable

* According to a Parliamentary paper, No. 4 of last Session, it appears that out of the 258 churches within the diocese of Llandaff there are 153 in which divine service is performed only once a week. What has been the consequence? On Sunday, the 13th of last month, the congregation in every church and chapel used for divine worship, according to the forms of the Established Church, in thirty-four districts in the diocese of Llandaff, were counted; the population of these districts amount to no less than 173,139, there is church accommodation for 17,440, and yet there was spare room in these churches on that day for 9,591; so that out of this vast population there were only 7,229 persons who attended the service of the Established Church on the day I have named.—*Vide Sir R. Hall's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,*

as to its beneficial effects; the people have no choice nor power in the selection or approval of men that have to take the highest position in the government of their Church, nor can they rid themselves of them, however obnoxious they may become in the dioceses over which they have the entire spiritual rule. There have been those who have sacrificed their principles, and have done violence to their consciences to obtain a see; there are those who encourage Popery in disguise. Why should not the laity have a voice in the selection of men to fill such important offices? (*Vox populi, vox Dei.*) In the early ages of the Church it was so; and until the growing evil of bishops usurping a lordly power and authority, not only over the laity but over their own brethren, the Church was pure and unspotted. When these abuses crept in, and the Church became eminent for her worldly possessions, then followed schism, then superstition, then idolatry. The intelligent reader will judge by the signs of the times what steps the Church of England has made towards such like evils by recent events.

That an union of the Church and State is politic the present aspect of affairs sufficiently shows; that the Queen should be regarded as the supreme head of the Church can no longer be doubted to be wise and well considered: it is a guarantee to all Protestants that their religion shall be guarded by the highest personages in the realm, and that if their spiritual interests are assailed, the one possessing the greatest temporal power, and being herself one in the same cause, will watch for their security and guard them from molestation. Those who dissent from the Church of England, but whose faith assimilates so near as to declare Popery their common enemy, must feel and know, that the same temporal power which protects the one shields and defends the other. Is not Popery a State Church? The necessity for England, then, having a State Church is obvious, for the very fact keeps the *dominion* of Popery from its threshold; divide it from the State, and you lessen the power of the State over the common foe. What would be the condition of the Wesleyans, the Baptists, and the numerous other sects of England, if Popery should predominate here? Would they have the same liberty as now? Would the Pope be as tolerant as his Cardinal sneers at us for having been? No. The spirit of toleration that our Government has shown has created an absolute necessity for the union of the Church and State. There are many Roman Catholics among our statesmen; should not, then, those who are appointed the heads of our religion have a voice (the voice of all Protestants) to watch over the temporal government, to ward off attacks that may be made, either directly or indirectly, against our faith?

That there is a great and radical reform wanted in the Church the preceding remarks will testify; the bishops, instead of being spiritually minded are carnally minded; and it is clear they are more in dread of losing their fat livings from the Pope's aggression, than that the pure religion of the Church of England will suffer by it.

We do not deny that the ministers of the Church should be entirely supported by the people; but we must protest against the amazing disparity in the emoluments of the clergy.

There is no remedy for existing evils but for the people to choose their own pastors, in which case they will have men of ability and zeal, in the place of ignorance, idleness, and self-sufficiency.

SPEECH OF SIR EDWARD SUGDEN AT THE SURREY COUNTY MEETING AT EPSOM.

DECEMBER 17, 1850.

Although I have passed a great portion of a long life in connexion with political affairs, it so happens that I never once before attended a county meeting. This, I say, is my first appearance at a county meeting, although I have, of course, often had the honour and pleasure of addressing my fellow-countrymen in public assemblies when seeking their suffrages as a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons. It is no light matter which could induce me, at my advanced period of life, to attend a county meeting for the first time, and particularly in such inclement weather as the present. I have been no party to the preparation of this meeting—I have not acted in concert with any one—I have not been in communication with any man on the subject. I come here as a simple freeholder and county man; and at the request of the committee, which I did not anticipate, I now come forward to move the first resolution. It is desirable that a distinct understanding should prevail as to the grounds on which we complain, and justly complain, of the Papal aggression. It is not that any man here intends to war against his fellow-subjects of the Roman Catholic religion. We have no such intention. In 1829, being then a member of the House of Commons, I voted—with doubt and hesitation, I admit—for the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. I have never repented of that vote, and I am prepared to repeat it to-morrow, if occasion should call for it. I have amongst my friends Roman Catholics whom I highly esteem, and whose friendship I should be extremely sorry to lose. I would not willingly utter a word calculated to wound the consciences of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. But I appear here on different and higher grounds. I come not to attack them, but to defend myself—to defend the supremacy of the Crown—the rights

and liberties of our own bishops and clergy—the rights and liberties of myself and of the people at large. Let it not be forgotten that we are assembled not for the purpose of attack and aggression on others, but simply to defend ourselves—simply to defend the rights we gained at the Reformation, and which we do not intend lightly to part with. Cardinal Wiseman said that the hostility which the people of England have displayed to the Papal bull originated at first in a feeling of impulse, although now it is attempted to be defended on grounds of reason. Doubtless the people, in the first instance, acted under an impulsive feeling. God has given to all animals an instinct which tells them when danger is near, and man, although of higher grade in the animal system, and endowed with reason, nevertheless possesses an instinctive apprehension of danger. It was this instinct which roused the English people to resist the Papal aggression. But what has happened since time has been afforded for calmly considering the question? I have consulted no one—I have joined no society—I have entered into no compact with any human being on this subject. I have calmly considered the matter as an Englishman in the quietude of my own study, and the result is that my reason and judgment sanction the impulsive feeling of resistance by which the aggression was originally met. I declare that, when first I read the Pope's bull, and Cardinal Wiseman's letter, I felt as if a blow had been aimed at me personally. I could not reconcile myself to the idea that a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster had been suddenly brought in amongst us—not as necessary to the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, which I desire my fellow-subjects of that persuasion should freely enjoy, but for the purpose of elevating the Bishop of Rome to superiority over the Queen of this country. We can hardly understand the ground on which we are proceeding, unless we first reflect on what it is the Pope has done. Is the Pope's proceeding, or is it not, against the law? and if it be, what are the modes by which we should seek to annul it? These are practical questions. Cardinal Wiseman asks what are we alarmed at?—"What is all this fuss about?" says he; "we always have had bishops in England, and we still have only bishops." I tell the Cardinal that though it may be true that there have always been Roman Catholic bishops in England, this is the first attempt which the Pope has made since the Reformation to appoint Bishops of England. Cardinal Wiseman next stated what the Pope had not done on two points, and which, happily, no one would dare to do, now that the voice of the people of this country has been declared as that of one man throughout the length and the breadth of the land. The voice of Englishmen is not confined to this country, but resounds throughout the world, and can make itself heard and feared even by the Bishop of Rome. Cardinal Wiseman in his second lecture, delivered last Sunday, complained of the criticism which had been bestowed on the phrase that "England was restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament," stating that it was intended to apply only to "Catholic England." "The phrase," says Dr. Wiseman, "is very pretty and poetical; but does any one suppose we mean that all the Protestant dissenters are Catholics—does any suppose we are so mad as to believe that the Anglican bishops and clergy are Catholics? The phrase is but a phrase, and what does it signify?" But when Cardinal Wiseman talks of Catholic England, I tell him he ought to speak of Protestant England with Roman Catholics in it, who are protected in the exercise of their religion, and in all civil rights. It is not Catholic England; it is, and shall be, Protestant England. By "Catholic" England Cardinal Wiseman means us to understand Roman Catholic England, and in that sense it is false to speak of this country as Catholic; for it is heart and soul Protestant England. I can conceive nothing more presumptuous than the pretensions advanced by the Pope. The Pontiff, who appears to be an amiable kind of person, having unfortunately thought proper to set about indoctrinating his subjects in a sort of sickly liberalism, ultimately became their slave, and escaped from his dangerous thralldom only by becoming a fugitive. Restored to his throne by foreign bayonets, he immediately interfered in the affairs of this country in a way which has created bitter dissensions between Protestants and Catholics. The Bishop of Rome, and all who have abetted him in this business, have incurred as dreadful a responsibility as ever attached to any set of men. Is it nothing to have, without occasion, roused the feelings of the whole people of England? Thank God, however, there has been no outrage—no bloodshed, and that the people have not allowed themselves to be goaded into violence, not even of language, speaking generally against their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects by the conduct of the Bishop of Rome. From the bottom of my heart I can declare that this circumstance has given me the greatest pleasure. I object to the Bishop of Rome establishing in this country a dominion such as he exercised in it immediately before the Reformation. We repudiated the Pope in the plenitude of his power; we will not succumb to him now. By the Reformation we established the Protestant liberty we now enjoy; and, let me remind you, that with religious liberty has grown the civil liberty of England. They have advanced hand in hand, and the consequence is, that while all the rest of Europe has been convulsed with revolutions England has stood erect, in quiet majesty, the glory and admiration of the world. It is this happy country which the Bishop of Rome has disturbed by the introduction of his edicts. The Pope affects to treat England as if she had no hierarchy of her own—to dispose of the country as he pleases. In spite of what Cardinal Wiseman says to the contrary in his last lecture, we know that we have a Church, and we mean to maintain it. Dr. Doy speaking in the same chapel in which Cardinal Wiseman lectured, said, "Time may end,

the Church will never end. The time may come when there may be no Archbishop of Canterbury, but the time will never come when there will not be an Archbishop of Westminster." It appears to me that is closely bordering on impiety, for the speaker affects to command not only the events of this world, but the will of the Deity. Setting that aside, however, Dr. Doyle's meaning was plainly this, that if we permitted the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, it would be ready to supply the place of our own hierarchy in the event of the enemies of the Protestant Church succeeding in subverting it. Cardinal Wiseman says, "After all, we have done nothing contrary to law." I am not at all satisfied on that head. The law on this point is certainly in a very anomalous state, and, I grieve to say, reflects no credit on the Legislature; but, nevertheless, I am of opinion that the law has been infringed by the Bishop of Rome and Cardinal Wiseman. A legal argument would be quite misplaced here, but Englishmen ought to know what it is they are entitled to complain of. Queen Elizabeth found all the English sees filled with Roman Catholic bishops, and being determined to give effect to the Reformation, her Parliament passed many acts for that purpose. Those acts were most grinding on the Roman Catholics, and, indeed, unendurable; and no man who comprehends the spirit of our constitution but must be delighted that they have been swept from the statute-book. The first Parliament of Elizabeth passed a law to declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, State, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. That was the law then, and that is the law now. But the other day, in the 9th and 10th of our present Queen—not following the example of the Relief Act—an Act of Parliament was passed which repealed certain provisions of this statute. By one part of the act of Elizabeth it was provided that whoever affirmed or acted upon the notion that any foreign prince, prelate, or potentate had any power, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within the realm, was subject to the most heavy punishments. The third of these was actually high treason, with the penalty of death and the loss and forfeiture of lands and goods. Now, no man could wish that to remain; it was a punishment that no man would inflict at this time of day, and it was therefore repealed by the 9th and 10th of Victoria; but the act which repealed this declares that, though the penalties and punishment are repealed, it shall still not be lawful for any person to affirm or maintain that any foreign person, prince, prelate, or potentate hath, or ought to have jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within the realm. Then, I assert here, and I am prepared to do so everywhere, that by the law as it stands the Bishop of Rome and his archbishops and cardinals have no right to assert or maintain that they have any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this realm. There was another act passed in the 13th year of Elizabeth to prevent bulls, letters, or instruments to be received from Rome for any cause whatever; no man was to put in use any bull, letters, or instrument from the Bishop of Rome in any case whatever, and if he did, not only he, but those who abetted him, were to be held guilty of high treason, and suffer death. Now, everybody knows that such a punishment could not be inflicted in these days, and therefore the penalty was swept away; but the act that swept away the penalty declared that the repeal should not go beyond the penalties and punishments, and that it was still unlawful for any man in this land to put in use any bull, writing, or instrument of the Bishop of Rome. I am aware a quibble might be raised on the construction of these acts, as to whether such persons could be punished or not; but I do not care much about that. The law is clear that no one is permitted to do such things. It is equally clear that, by the repeal of the act so far, it was intended to enable the Roman Catholic to put himself in communication, as he was already in communion, with the See of Rome, for it was said there was no use in granting to the Roman Catholics the free exercise of their religion if they could not communicate with the head of their Church. Nothing could be more reasonable, and, therefore, nothing that was necessary to enable them to communicate with the head of their religion could be objected to; that being the object of the repeal. But that repeal does at the same time enact that nothing in the act shall authorise any one to introduce or publish any instrument from the Bishop of Rome. That, therefore, is the law now. Now I say that law has been infringed; and though those pains and those punishments are no longer operative that were inflicted by the statutes of Elizabeth, yet there are punishments that the law will inflict on those who disregard the injunctions of the Legislature. The great measure for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, called, as you all know, the Relief Act, was passed in 1829, and it took this shape:—That act did not repeal the various Acts of Parliament which had been from the time of the Reformation passed against the Roman Catholics, but it suspended them, and it is said that if the Roman Catholic will take the oaths introduced by this Act of Parliament he shall enjoy all our civil rights, and all our religious liberties. Now there are very few of the Roman Catholics who take that oath, because, unless they are entering upon some office which they otherwise cannot occupy, or going into the House of Lords or Commons, they are not called upon to take it. But there is no Roman Catholic who is enjoying all his civil and religious liberties in this country who is not morally bound by that oath, as his rights are guaranteed to him on the ground of his taking the oath, and the only reason why he enjoys so many benefits without taking the oath is, that we have what is called "an Annual Indemnity Act," and that those who have not taken the oaths enjoined by the law are every year relieved from the penalties

they have themselves sanctioned for not obeying the law. I consider, therefore, that every Roman Catholic gentleman is bound by the provisions of the Relief Act, though not taking the oath, enjoying, as he does, all the benefits which that act confers. That oath requires him to swear that the Bishop of Rome has no temporal or civil power in this realm. It leaves out the words "that the Bishop of Rome and no other prelate, has any spiritual or ecclesiastical authority in the realm;" that was to relieve his conscience; and here I observe what Roman Catholics have lost sight of, that, remaining as we do a Protestant country, we take the oath that no person, princes, prelate, or potentate, has any jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastical, within the kingdom. Then as to the other obligations the Roman Catholics enter into. He swears that he will, to the utmost of his power, defend the present establishment of property within this realm. He swears not to subvert the present Church establishment in this country; and, lastly, he swears that he will not exercise any rights he has, or may obtain, towards weakening or endangering the Protestant religion or Government in this country. Then I ask you whether the Bishop of Rome, or rather those who abet him in this country—for the Bishop of Rome himself is, of course, not bound by such an oath—I ask whether they have acted up merely to the oath they have taken? Is the recent act of the Bishop of Rome no attempt to subvert the Church of this country, and to undermine the Protestant Government? The Bishop of Rome tells us plainly that his object is to establish a Roman Catholic hierarchy, and that Roman Catholic hierarchy, as Dr. Doyle says, is to flourish for ever. The Archbishopric of Westminster, he says, will cease never: that of Canterbury may cease in a day. If that is not endeavouring to subvert a Church establishment, I should like to know what is. If you had a water company in this town that was supplying through their pipes water to the inhabitants, and if some rival company proceeded to lay down pipes alongside and to erect steam-engines, would you not naturally think that the object of this new company was to take the trade from the other, if by any means they could, and supply the inhabitants with water? and, if they had no power, you would certainly think they had no right to subvert the old company, or to interfere with their concerns. The object of the Bishop of Rome is to establish, by slow degrees it may be, the dominion we shook off at the Reformation, and which we will never again submit to. Gentlemen, I will not longer detain you. Your own feelings will supply what I have omitted. I had no intention whatever of taking any part in the proceedings, and it was not till I was pressed that I consented to put myself forward on this occasion. I have to apologise for having expressed myself so imperfectly; but I hope no man here or elsewhere will misunderstand the grounds on which I have come forward. My object is not to attack my fellow-subjects, the Roman Catholics. My acts, in this respect, have always kept pace with my words. I have held an office in which I was surrounded by Roman Catholics, and there I was put to the test on this point. I can say confidently, however, I never neglected the interests of a single Roman Catholic whom I found entitled to consideration because he was such. I considered only talent, character, and good conduct, and his religion never entered into my mind or influenced me in any way whatever. I therefore repel with scorn the argument of Cardinal Wiseman, that those who have got up these meetings have done it to gull the people with fanaticism. I say it is untrue. The people have not been gulled at all, nor driven into fanaticism. I disown every approach to fanaticism; but I feel deeply the indignation that every English Protestant ought to feel, and that every English Roman Catholic, too, ought to feel, for he has a common interest with us all in enjoying the blessings of the constitution, and therefore it is his interest to oppose the aggressions of the Pope. May we ever remain, as we now are, a Protestant country, governed by a Queen whom we love, and love not merely because she is our Queen, not merely because loyalty is inherent within us, but because, under a constitutional monarchy, we enjoy blessings unknown in any other part of the world. I say, let us enjoy these blessings, and, without interfering with the religion of any man, let us as Protestants support and maintain our Protestant Church and faith even to the death.—The right hon. gentleman then moved the following resolution:—

"That this meeting, earnestly devoted to that pure and apostolic faith which our forefathers successfully vindicated at the Reformation, have observed with the deepest concern and indignation the increasing pretensions and encroachments of the Romish See within this kingdom—pretensions which have recently resulted in an unwarrantable aggression on the Queen's undoubted prerogative by the Bishop of Rome, who has by his bull or letter of the 29th of September last arrogantly assumed the right of parcelling out the realm into dioceses, conferring territorial jurisdiction, with titles of dignity founded thereon, and claiming thereby a dominion over the consciences of all the baptized subjects of her Majesty"

DR. WISEMAN AND DR. CUMMING.

TO MR. BOWYER.

Sir,—I can very readily comprehend your zeal for Dr. Wiseman. Recent converts are invariably overflowing with it. I can also easily forgive your transparent anxiety to shelter the new hierarchy and its head by trying to turn the whole matter into a dispute about courtesy, and an inquiry whether, in my addresses at the Hanover Rooms, I had spoken under a deep sense of what is due to a "Prince of the Church." Beyond these points I can discover nothing in your letter which I have not amply disposed of. What Mr. Bowyer thinks of Dr. Cumming, or what Dr. Cumming thinks of Mr. Bowyer, is a subject the public care very little about, and therefore I leave your verbal criticisms on such a topic without note or comment.

Toward Dr. Wiseman, as a scholar and a man of high scientific attainments, I cherish true respect, and in my lecture at the Hanover Rooms I rendered him every justice in this character. But my speech was not the dissection of a scholar or of a gentleman, as such, but of a "Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster," who has come to "govern the counties of Essex and Middlesex;" and who, to prepare his subjects—all the baptised—for his reception, has edited the life and commended as the reflection of that of his Church, and *a fortiori* of his own, the moral theology of Liguori. In the morals of this saint—morals applauded and commended by our new archiepiscopal ruler—such sentiments as these occur:—

"Notwithstanding, indeed, although it is not lawful to lie, or to feign what is not, however it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words or other ambiguous and doubtful signs for a just cause, and when there is not a necessity of confessing."

Again—

"These things being established, it is a certain and a common opinion among all divines that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation in the propounded modes, and to confirm it (equivocation) with an oath."

And again—

"When you are not asked concerning the faith, not only is it lawful, but often more conducive to the glory of God and the utility of your neighbour, to cover the faith than to profess it; for example, if concealed among heretics, you may accomplish a greater amount of good—or, if from the confession of the faith more of evil will follow—for example, great trouble, death, the hostility of a tyrant, the peril of defection, if you should be tortured—whence it is often rash to offer oneself willingly."

After reading Dr. Wiseman's approbation of these and worse sentiments, you will not be surprised if I hesitate in a great public matter to accept anything as evidence except authorised and accredited documents. I call your attention, and that of Dr. Wiseman, whose zealous solicitor you are, to the following plain facts:—

1. I alleged that every archbishop of your Church must take an oath, in which the persecuting clause occurs, before he receives the *pallium*. This is declared in the *Pontificale Romanum*, a document Dr. Wiseman has, and must have; prefixed to which are the solemn bulls or rescripts of Urban VIII., Clement VIII., and Benedict XIV., forbidding any one to add to, or subtract from, or in any other way alter this document.

2. I drew the very natural inference in these words, "I presume that Dr. Wiseman took the oath in that document, as required by his Church of all recipients of the *pallium*."

3. I am first told, in answer to this, that in virtue of a rescript of Pius VII., bishops in places under the British Crown are excused taking one particular clause in the oath at their consecration, and that I shall find the copy of the oath "perhaps generally used in the consecration of bishops in England" in the episcopal residence, Golden-square.

4. My reply to this is what I have insisted on—that the oath I presumed Dr. Wiseman to have taken, as the *Pontifical* requires, was the oath on receiving the *pallium*, which robe he declares he has received, and not the oath on his being consecrated bishop. I examined his own *Pontifical*. I find the persecuting clause in the bishop's oath with an ink line drawn along it; but I find the oath for an archbishop on receiving the *pallium* with the persecuting clause untouched—clear, bold, distinct. Naturally enough, I inferred there is a confirmation of the truth of my presumption in the Cardinal's own *Pontifical*.

5. Another and additional answer is sent in order to meet every possible contingency, viz., that Dr. Wiseman did not take any oath on receiving the *pallium*; an announcement far more extraordinary than if the Bishop of London were to state that he ordained without using the service in the Prayer-book appointed for that purpose, because, in Dr. Wiseman's case, it is the present infallible Pope Pius IX. flying in the face of three previous infallibilities—Urban VIII., Clement VIII., and Benedict XIV.; and so overriding rubrics, *Pontificales*, bulls, and *cereemoniales*, and maintaining the unity of his Church by standing alone.

6. But naturally alarmed at the possibility of such an inference, Mr. Searle adds, "Cardinals being exempt."

Before I communicate some information on this subject, I request Dr. Wiseman or yourself to inform me:—

1. What was or is the ground of exemption in a Cardinal's case?
2. Where, or in what authentic document, a Cardinal (who may be a layman) is declared exempt from taking the oaths prescribed on being made a bishop, archbishop, or patriarch?
3. Lastly, I require a distinct answer to this, the last question I feel it necessary to put at present—viz., did Dr. Wiseman before, at, or after, receiving the cardinalial hat take an oath?

I wait till I receive direct answers to these three questions, and, for special reasons, emphatically to the last, before I trouble the *Times* or yourself again.

I am, Sir, your faithful Servant,
JOHN CUMMING.

THE PAPAL RESCRIPT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,—A copy of a very important document has just been placed in my hands, which should be made known to the public. It is the rescript of the Propaganda, written to the Irish bishops by authority and command of the Pope,* on the 23rd June, 1791:—

The instrument commences as follows:—

“We perceive from your late letter the great uneasiness you labour under since the publication of a pamphlet, entitled ‘The Present State of the Church of Ireland,’ from which our detractors have taken occasion to renew the old calumny against the Catholic religion with increased acrimony, namely, that this religion is by no means compatible with the safety of kings and republics; because, as they say, the Roman Pontiff being the father and master of all Catholics, and invested with such great authority that he can free the subjects of other kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to kings and princes, he has it in his power, they contend, to cause disturbances and injure the public tranquillity of kingdoms with ease. We wonder that you should be uneasy at these complaints, especially after your most excellent brother and apostolical fellow-labourer, the Archbishop of Cashel [James Butler, D.D.], and other strenuous defenders of the Holy See, had evidently refuted and dissipated (*refutarint plane ac diluerint*) these slanderous reproaches in their celebrated writings.”

After some further observations the rescript lays down the following important propositions:—

“Nunquam sedes Romana docuit heterodoxis fidem non esse servandam; violari posse juramentum regibus a Catholicâ communione disjunctis prestitum; Pontifici Romano licere temporalia eorum jura ac dominia invadere. Horrendum vero, ac detestabile facinus etiam apud nos est si quis unquam, atque etiam religionis pretextu, in regum ac principum vitam audeat quidpiam aut molitur.—The Holy See never taught that faith was not to be kept with the heterodox; that an oath to kings separated from the Catholic communion can be violated; that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We also consider any attempt or design against the life of kings and princes, even under the pretext of religion, to be a horrible and detestable crime.”

Here we have a perfect disclaimer and condemnation by the Holy See of the supposed Papal authority to encroach on the powers of the civil magistrate, and of all other things now publicly imputed to our Church.

The rescript then proceeds to explain as follows the words, *Hereticos pro posse perseguar et impugnavo*, in the oath taken by bishops, and to authorise the omission of those words.

“His Holiness Pius VI., has not, however, disregarded your requests; and therefore, in order effectually to remove every occasion of civil and calumny, which, as you write, some borrow from the words in the form of the oath of obedience to the Apostolic See that bishops are required to take at their consecration—I will prosecute and oppose heretics, &c., to the utmost of my power—which words are maliciously interpreted as the signal of war against heretics, authorising persecution and assault against them as enemies; whereas the pursuit and opposition to heretics which bishops undertake are to be understood as referring to their solicitude and efforts in convincing heretics of their error, and procuring their reconciliation with the Catholic Church—his Holiness has graciously condescended to substitute in place of the ancient form of oath that one, which was publicly repeated by the Archbishop of Mohilou.”

The rescript then enlarges on the duty of obedience to the civil power inculcated by the Catholic religion, and appeals to the fact that, when several provinces in North

* A Pastoral Instruction, &c., by J. T. Troy, D.D., &c., p. 42. Dublin, 1793.

America, inhabited chiefly by Protestants, renounced their allegiance to the British Crown, that of Canada, filled with innumerable Catholics, though not forgetful of the old French Government, remained faithful. Added to the rescript is the form of oath which has been already published, and which is taken by all Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops in the British empire.

The above extract contains the declaration of the imponent himself, explaining the meaning of the words *persequar et impugnabo*. Of course the oath is taken according to the meaning of the imponent, who has solemnly declared that the words *persequar* and *impugnabo* do not signify, and are not to be taken as signifying—I will persecute and wage war with. Even if it were not absurd to suppose that any man would profess to “persecute” (a word always used in an unfavourable sense), this declaratory canonical enactment must set the question at rest.

I do not, indeed, deny that in former times prelates of the Roman Church have persecuted; but I say that no Roman Catholic bishop engages to persecute heretics, and that persecution is no doctrine or principle of our Church.

Persecution is inculcated in some of the works of the Canonists. But are they alone liable to this reproach? Look at the statutes against nonconformity and recusancy. Priests have suffered death under the penal code, with no offence charged in the indictment, except the performance of divine worship. And Lord Mansfield, within memory of man, defeated a prosecution of that description by cross-examining the chief witness, who could not prove that he saw the prisoner celebrate mass. It is true that the penal statutes were temporal laws; but they were passed with the full concurrence of the Established Church represented in Parliament.

The Scottish Kirk is not more blameless. The national covenant and confession of faith declares that their faith is the only true Christian faith pleasing to God, and that they abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly all kind of papistry in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the word of God and the Kirk of Scotland. And the Confession approves and recites divers statutes agreeable to that declaration, as:—

“That Papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed, according to the intention of the Acts of Parliament repeated in the 5th Act of Parliament, 20th King James VI., and to that end they ordain that all Papists and priests be punished with manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains, as adversaries of God’s true religion, preached and by law established within this realm—Act 24, Parl. 11, King James VI.—as common enemies to all Christian government . . . as idolaters—Act 104, Parl 7, King James IV. . .” &c. &c.

And Article 2 of the “Solemn League and Covenant” is as follows:—

“No. 2. . . . That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men’s sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues, and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms.”

The words “endeavour the extirpation,” “without respect of persons,” are not to be mistaken; and the concluding sentence, “that the Lord may be one and his word one in the three kingdoms,” seems sufficiently “aggressive.” Yet I find this instrument in a book printed “by authority,” by the Queen’s printer, in 1845, entitled “The Confession of Faith . . . together with the sum of saving knowledge . . . Covenants, national and solemn league . . .” &c.

I do not cite these authorities by way of what is vulgarly called a *tu quoque*, but to show how unjust it is to affix the stigma of present intolerance and persecution to a Church or sect, because their predecessors persecuted, or because a persecuting spirit is found in some of their books which belong to bygone history.

There were times when zealots, whatever their creed might be, persecuted those to whom they were opposed, whenever they had the power of doing so. Elizabeth burnt Papists, as Mary burnt Protestants. As the Council of Constance burnt Huss, so Calvin burnt Servetus. This was a mode of refutation commonly used in those days, when men

“Proved their doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks.”

But in our present state of civilisation, not only religious toleration but religious liberty are universally admitted as established principles of public law; and whatever the decrees of Gratian and some of the old Canonists may say, they are not the voice of the Church, and I protest against their opinions or the obsolete laws which they cite being made the test of the spirit which now regulates the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE BOWYER,

THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD AND THE DEAN AND CHAPTER.

The Dean and Chapter of Hereford had a meeting, at which they voted an address to the Bishop of the diocese, on "the recent aggression of the Bishop of Rome upon the civil and religious constitution of these realms."

The following is the chief paragraph in the address voted to his lordship:—

"As by the Papal bull lately promulgated—a bull unrivalled in audacity and arrogance since the days of Queen Elizabeth—the just prerogative of the Crown is invaded, the authority of the Queen superseded, and the spirit, if not the letter, of the law violated, so with most unchristian intolerance is the very existence of our Church virtually denied; her ministry, ordinances, and sacraments held as things that are not; and her whole congregation of faithful men excluded from the pale of Christianity."

The address having been forwarded to the Bishop, his lordship returned the following reply, dated from the Palace at Hereford:—

"To the Very Rev. the Dean and the Rev. the Canons of the Cathedral Church of Hereford.

"REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,—The expression of your earnest and deep indignation at the recent scandalous outrage of the Papal power on the civil and religious constitution of these realms gives me very great assurance and comfort.

"You, my brethren, as the chief members of the Cathedral Church, are, by your position, associated with me as fellow-councillors in the Lord; and to you also the rest of the clergy throughout the diocese naturally look for counsel and guidance in any emergency of the Church.

"I cannot, therefore, but welcome and heartily thank you for the zeal with which you have come forward on the present momentous occasion, and encouraged your brethren, and myself in particular, to meet the struggle which is now forced on us with the like Christian determination. We might, indeed, in the strength of that Divine grace which has been manifestly vouchsafed to our Church, and by which it has been set up as a city on a hill to Christendom, laugh to scorn this presumptuous aggression of an anti-Christian power as utterly impotent for the accomplishment of its evil designs. But we know the arts of that subtle power. History has told us how insidiously it advances—with what stealthy steps it works its way to its own selfish aggrandisement; and therefore that assumption of titles and partitioning of our country into new dioceses, as of a land conquered from heresy and infidelity, set forth in the Papal document, frivolous and contemptible as it may seem, has, we cannot doubt, a real design of usurpation lurking under it, and of ultimate persecution of the faith wherein we stand. And the occasion demands, accordingly, the most determined resistance from us as Christians, as loyal subjects of our gracious Queen, and as devoted sons of our Church.

"Continue then, my brethren, to hold that firm and unflinching attitude of resistance in which you have stood up, and in which, indeed, the whole country is now standing up as one man against the assault. Approach the throne and the Houses of Parliament with petitions against this insidious attempt of the Papacy, praying that measures may be adopted without delay by which the insolence of the adversary may be repressed, and his devices against our Constitution in Church and State, and, above all, against our holy faith, made to recoil on himself to his own utter confusion. On your own individual exertions in your respective spheres of duty for the inculcation of gospel truth in itself, as well as in its opposition to the manifold forms of error, and to those especially (as the times demand) of the great apostasy of Papal Rome—on these exertions, and on your prayers (the greatest security, after all) continually offered up to the Divine Head of the Church, I am sure I may confidently reckon.

"I remain, rev. and dear brethren,

"Your affectionate brother in Christ,

"R. D. HEREFORD."

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

The Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle returned the following answer to the address of the clergy of the diocese, at the meeting held at Penrith on the 21st Dec. :—

"Rose Castle, Nov. 25.

"My dear Mr. Chancellor and Brethren,—I have received, with great satisfaction, the address that you have forwarded to me, and I feel that, after so long a residence among and personal intercourse with you it is hardly needful that I should declare my entire concurrence in your

declarations against the assumption of authority by the Bishop of Rome in the appointment of ecclesiastics, nominated by himself, to several dioceses in this kingdom, claiming spiritual jurisdiction over all the members of the Church of Christ therein; the bull of the Bishop of Rome denying the existence of the Church of England as a branch of the universal Church of Christ, invading the prerogative of the Crown, and violating the principles of the constitution.

"Soon after the repeal of the laws affecting Roman Catholics in this country, I stated to you my conviction, that that concession would neither diminish their activity nor weaken their endeavours to enlarge the boundaries of their Church, nor incline them to neglect any opportunity to depreciate the character and attack the principles of the Established Church of this country. How fully have the late proceedings of the Church of Rome justified that statement! I did not call your attention to the matter, however, to excite hostility, but to urge your diligence and industry, that, under the blessing of the Almighty, our pure and reformed religion might continue established in the affections of those committed to our charge. The reformers of our Church were no uninformed enthusiasts, acted upon by fervid imaginations or unchastened zeal; they were sober-minded, grave, inquiring, cautious, discreet. They did not condemn for condemnation's sake, but because scriptural truth required it. Satisfied that the doctrine of the Reformation was the doctrine of the Gospel, they contended and died for it. In the height of their mortal agony they preserved their faith unshaken, they maintained their charity unspotted, they looked to the honour of God and the welfare of His Church.

"I will not contrast the spirit of Dr. Wiseman's observations with this conduct. The corruptions, the superstitions, the usurpations of the Church of Rome remain the same. The epithet, '*Semper eadem*,' which she has ever claimed, is still her peculiar characteristic as ever. We have Dr. Ullathorne's declaration that 'What has been done no power on earth can undo.' 'We sincerely and warmly congratulate you,' is the address of another Roman Catholic ecclesiastic at Beverley, 'on the restoration to England of her long lost and anxiously desired hierarchy.' Can I but with pleasure, under such circumstances, receive the assurance of the clergy of this diocese of their unshaken attachment to the Church of England as settled at the Reformation, of their indignation at the claims of the Church of Rome to the entire spiritual jurisdiction within these realms, and their determination to discountenance, as they have hitherto done (and most thankfully do I take this opportunity of bearing my testimony to, and full approbation of that conduct), all practices which may tend to undermine the Protestant faith, and familiarise the minds of their flocks with the superstitious observances of the Church of Rome?

"You ask, brethren, my counsel and advice in the present crisis. You have protested, in your address to her Majesty, against the aggression of the Church of Rome. It may be necessary to petition the Houses of Parliament for that protection to our national Church which was intended, but may not have been effectually carried out, by the act of George IV., c. 7, commonly called the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act—protection, strongly marked by that portion of the oath to be administered to Roman Catholics upon their admission to certain offices and privileges, 'I do solemnly swear that I will never exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government of the United Kingdom.' I would not encourage the spirit of controversy in your sermons, as more apt to inflame men's passions than to inform their minds: still, it is your bounden duty to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word; to be careful that no evil suggestions may unsettle the minds of your parishioners. Anxiously watch over the religious education of the poorer children of your parishes. Teach them to be frequent and diligent in studying the Holy Scriptures, for in them only, in the words of one of our old divines, 'have we the measure of all God's wisdom and knowledge in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, discovered to mankind. Here only have we the authentic declarations of God's mercy to us, and the conditions upon which we are to expect salvation from them. Here it is whence we are to fetch both the matter of our faith and our evidence for the truth of it; and, judge now whether, these things considered, the Bible be not a book to be studied by all sorts of persons.'

"By your examples, prove yourselves worthy ministers of the gospel of Christ; and, with prayer to the Almighty Disposer of Events, that He will keep His Church and household continually in His true religion, that we, who do lean only upon the hope of His heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by His mighty power, through Jesus Christ our Lord, we may humbly trust that the light of His countenance will not be withdrawn from us, nor the wiles of the adversary be permitted to prevail against us.

"I am, my dear Chancellor and brethren,

"Your affectionate friend and brother,

"H. CARLISLE."

MR. MOLYNEUX TAYLOR.

Mr. Molyneux Taylor has addressed the following to the editor of the *Morning Herald*:—

“SIR,—My attention has recently been directed to a leading article published in your paper of the 23rd ult., respecting the will of my late father, Mr. Taylor, of Weybridge, which had previously, it appears, been made the subject of a very unfounded personal charge against Cardinal Wiseman. Had I seen that article earlier I should have felt myself bound to notice it, and in order to prevent any permanent misconception it seems still incumbent on me to address you a few words of explanation.

“It is strictly correct, as stated by Cardinal Wiseman, that he was wholly unacquainted with my father in his lifetime, and also that my father’s death took place before the Cardinal came to London, or was connected with the Catholic Church of this district. It is also correct that he was not personally named in the will, and it is further due to him to state, that from all I know, or have heard of him, I believe him to be far too honest and high-minded to be concerned directly or indirectly in such a transaction.

“With respect to what Cardinal Wiseman, in his letter, terms my “supposed disinheritance,” I must add that the substance of the will is correctly stated in your article. The bulk of my father’s property is left to his children for their lives only, and upon their decease the inheritance is given to the use of the late Dr. Griffiths, if living, and if not, to the then vicar apostolic of the London district for the time being. The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whether in favour of a wife or children as to the property so devised; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at inebriance or alienation.

Such a will appears to me to create, not a supposed, but a real and effectual disinheritance, and such I have always felt it to be. I should add, that the will was executed by a most kind and affectionate parent, after he had attained the age of 80 and upwards, and when his mind was affected by severe illness, and in immediate contemplation of that great change, the approach of which renders the strongest and best-prepared wholly unable to resist any influences which may be brought to assume the sanction of religion. I should further add, that about four years before, my father had executed a will in which his whole property had been left for the benefit of his children.

As the heir-at-law, and the person most affected by this well-intentioned, but most unjust and mistaken act, I was advised to contest the will, and obtain, through the Court of Chancery, a full disclosure of the circumstances under which it was made; but I forbore from doing so, because I was unwilling to expose my family to the vexations and difficulties of a Chancery suit; and I felt that no earthly consideration could induce me to expose those I had loved and cherished from my earliest infancy, and who had been induced to acquiesce in the will, to the ordeal of Chancery and legal interrogatories in order to compel painful and unwilling disclosures relative to matters which they would consider to be sacred as the wishes of a dying parent.

I believe that, by the laws of most Catholic countries, such a will would be *ipso facto* void. Whether it is so by the law of England, independent of any special disclosures or secret trusts, is a question which I reserve to myself the full liberty of considering, if necessary, at any future time. I am bound in candour to state this, or otherwise the effect of the correspondence published in your paper would be to produce the impression of complete acquiescence upon my part in an act, though originating in the best of motives on the part of the testator, I must always feel to be a great injustice, and calculated to throw a shade of sorrow over my path through life.

I am, sir, your obedient, humble servant,

J. MOLYNEUX TAYLOR.

Furnival's-inn, Holborn, Dec. 2, 1850.

A FEW MORE WORDS TO ENGLISHMEN OF ALL PERSUASIONS.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN,—What a man the Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham is! Perhaps in the whole peerage a more absurd specimen of mankind could not be found. When he attempts to say anything, he is always noisy, always boasting, always predicting evil, and never acknowledging good. Now it is the Corn-laws; now it is Popery. All England, his lordship says, go with him; and yet the aged peer almost remains in a ridiculous minority of one. Poor old gentleman!

Let us consider, my fellow-countrymen, the effect of Lord Winchilsea’s mode of operation

if *Premier* (which calamity for Old England may He avert); universal war, another eight or nine millions of taxes showered upon a starving people, and for what? A few rectors tremble for their tithes, and a few bishops are afraid they may have to *define* the Church they belong to! Englishmen! Fellow-countrymen, what nonsense is all this?

As I before told you; if you do not want to become Catholics, no power on earth can make you. If you are journeying towards Rome, not even Dr. Cumming's vulgarity can stop you.

It would be as well, however, if Cardinal Wiseman will call upon the Lord of Winchelsea to become "a Papist," for that nobleman pledges himself to become one "if Popery is founded on the Bible," and that it is, my friends (however corrupt it may have grown I say not), this fact proves: that nothing founded on a less solid structure could have survived the attack of the wealthy, the revilers of the unlettered, and the penal laws of England.

I want to say a few words to you all upon the law of the case. The "insult" offered by the Bishop or Pope of Rome to our beloved Queen. In the first place, where is the insult? Had Pio Nono addressed the bull (even *pro forma*) to our gracious Queen, commanding her to admit his bishops, an insult would, of course, be fixed; but when the bull is addressed to the Catholics of England, what supremacy does it assert over that portion of England which is Protestant? All Englishmen have a right to free spiritual ruling; that is, they have a perfect right to yield their spiritual allegiance wherever and to whomsoever they please. Catholics are not exempt from taxes because they are Catholics, or from church-rates, or tithes. They are drawn as jurors, and were special constables on the 10th of April; and if the head of their Church resides at Rome, that head has a *right* (and by *English* law where is the illegality?) of addressing such directions from time to time to his spiritual subjects in England as he may choose.

But the assumption of the titles—the cities of Westminster, Nottingham, and Northampton—that is the vexing question. Well, upon that. How can any man less than a bishop, less busive than Dr. Croly, and less inclined to infidelity than the Rev. Mr. Gregg, discern the difference between an insult offered by the Bishop of Westminster which is *not* offered by the Bishop of Melopotamus? No one attempts to prove that; no one shows the difference between them. The Westminster bishop gets no more from England than did him of Melopotamus. Yet one is an insult and not the other. What stuff! Oh, but, cry the Press, suppose the Austrian Emperor created a Duke of Chester, or Earl of London, what then? Well, what then? If the gentleman remained at Vienna, no one would know it, and it would be no more insult than a monkey-faced black woman baptising her ugly infant "Victoria." And over here the Austrian Duke of Chester would not want to come. There is no analogy between the two cases. The man who attempts to argue upon them is as absurd as the Earl of Winchelsea and Nottingham.

In spite of the exultations of the morning press, I am glad, my generous countrymen, you have not in this clerical riot taken such a decided part; I am glad for two reasons:—the first is, Is the Church of England the Church of Christ? the second, What have its clergy done for you that you should fight their battles, that you should commit anyhow an act of injustice, not justified to your God, to please men who look upon you, to a great extent, only as so many ratepayers, ministers to their wants and fancies.

To the first question, I say, as I said before, seek the truth. Our Saviour converted the Jews. Be ye converted, if ye are convinced; remain Protestants, if ye are satisfied; but by Protestants I do not mean the Established Church, although that is the treasury of the Protestant body. I fear me there is too much purple and fine linen there to please the Creator—too little caring after the salvation of the soul, only heeding the comfort of the body. Before, then, fellow-countrymen, you seek to cry down Catholicism, search for yourselves, and ascertain if Popery is false, or whether that which is said to be the spawn of the Evil One may not really be the almost only antagonist the Evil One hath.

And, now, what has the Church done for you? Does it perform the slightest act without a fee? In addition to its power of taxation, to which you must either surrender your purse or your bed, I grant you the clergy are in many cases a "jolly set of fellows;" but can you imagine St. Paul riding after a poor fox through a corn-field? or do you think St. James went shooting over any man's land, refusing to that man the right of a shot? Keep quiet, then, Englishmen! What has been done for you? Besides, bear this in mind, this question has not been agitated as one of *privilege*, but one of *religion*. The cry is against Catholics, when there are many Catholics opposed to the measure, not because of the want of right, but from the simple fact that they are anxious to keep the peace, and live in harmony with all men. I know some of you think the Catholics have no right to their diocesan, because the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Beaumont say they are opposed to it. Why, my friends, the one is Master of the Horse, and the other hopes to be Governor of Malta, and that is the head and front of their letters, misses not of their minds but of their places. Those two noblemen represent (or misrepresent) themselves, and no one else.

I do not wish to ask you to become Catholics; I ask you only to keep quiet. Be just, if you will not be (what I fondly believe my countrymen to be) generous. Catholics are not allowed to speak from platforms, or to move amendments to resolutions. Do not, men of England! gag their mouths, and then "bully" them (I must crave pardon for indulging in this *clerical* word) for their faith. Hear them, or be silent yourselves; fair play is an English-

man's birthright. Give it to the Romanist, lest you have to retract your words, like the Rev. Mr. M'Neile.

I am not writing up or writing down a Church, I am only crying "Justice!" Corruption there may be in the Church of Rome as well as in the English Establishment, or the Wesleyan government. Shut your eyes to this cry of "corruption!"—close your ears to the shouts of "unholy priests!" It is no denial of God's Church because Borgia was a Pope, for there was once an Apostle who was called Judas; but, in fair play, remember that, while Rome may be twitted with her Borgias and her Gothards, the English Church may also be noted for her connexion with the Bishop of Clogher. Purity in a Church does not mean purity in her followers. If it did, what Church is pure?

Men of England! be you, then, quiet.

AN ENGLISHMAN.

CONTENTS.

THE "ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION."

FIRST SERIES.—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the two Letters to the "Times" by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the "New Batch of Bishops," from the "Weekly Dispatch;" two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;" concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES.—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 2, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, Nov. 7, 1850.

THIRD SERIES.—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the "Vatican Masquerade."

FOURTH SERIES.—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland (an original article), by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the "Queen and the Pope."

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and Leading Articles from the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note by the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of "Catholicus;" Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

SEVENTH SERIES.—Leading Articles on Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto, from the Daily and Weekly Press; also Letters and Replies from the Bishops of the Established Church.

EIGHTH SERIES.—Letter from Joseph Hume, Esq., M.P.; Fourteen Letters from Bishops of the Established Church; Dr. Doyle's Sermon, Nov. 17th; Catholic Bishop of Newport's Pastoral; and a Letter from a Correspondent.

NINTH SERIES.—Mr. Roebuck's Letter to Lord John Russell; the Rev. Mr. Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell; and Letter from Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., M.P., to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

TENTH SERIES.—Sermons by Cardinal Wiseman at St. George's Catholic Church, Southwark; Letters from Dr. Cumming and Mr. Bowyer; and the Address from the Bishops to the Queen.

ELEVENTH SERIES.—Addresses to the Crown; Resignation of Mr. Bennett, of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; the Protestant Agitation, by "Carolus;" and Lord Beaumont's Letter to the Earl of Zetland.

TWELFTH SERIES.—Correspondence between the Bishop of London and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett; the Duke of Norfolk; Roman Catholic "Pastorals;" and Lord John Russell and the Puseyites.

THIRTEENTH SERIES.—The Canterbury and Exeter Correspondence; the Bishop of St. David's and the Archbishop of Canterbury; Cardinal Wiseman's Second Lecture; the Rev. Dr. M'Neile; the Bishop of Norwich; and Episcopal Church in Scotland.

The **FIFTEENTH SERIES** will contain various specially interesting Documents.

All at the extraordinary low price of One Penny each Series; or, Postage Free, Threepence.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

MR. HENRY VINCENT, THE POPE, THE BISHOPS, AND THE
PEOPLE;

ADDRESS TO CARDINAL WISEMAN;
THE ALLEGED AGGRESSION OF THE POPE; AND
OBSERVATIONS ON THE QUEEN'S SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY,
AND OTHER TOPICS.

R. HENRY VINCENT, THE POPE, THE BISHOPS, AND THE PEOPLE.

A large audience paid, on Monday evening, December 2, 1850, for admission into the Public Hall, Baillie-street, Rochdale, to hear Mr. Henry Vincent lecture upon "The Pope's Bull, the Church of England's alarm, and the duty of Dissenters with regard to the 'No Popery' outcry."

Mr. VINCENT said—Ladies and gentlemen, I come before you to-night deeply impressed with the importance of the great theme that I desire to discuss in your presence; for while at all times the question of civil and religious liberty must be regarded as one of the most important questions that can engage the thoughts of a people, I feel that, at the present time, in the midst of the general agitation that prevails in this country, it is a matter of the greatest importance that the people do not allow themselves to be misled by any merely excited view of the great questions at issue, but endeavour to ground themselves more firmly than ever in those great principles of civil and religious liberty which will survive many storms, many blasts, and many persecutions—and which neither politicians, Pope, cardinals, nor bishops, will ever be strong enough entirely to destroy. To-night, then, before I approach the more immediate object of my first lecture, let me direct your attention for a few moments to the abstract principle of religious freedom; for I have always felt that throughout Christendom Christianity has suffered more from the false views held by many of her own professed devotees than from those who have avowedly lifted either the pen or the tongue to stay her triumphant progress. Religious freedom consists, I take it, in the individual right of every human being to worship his Maker according to the dictates of his own conscience—no merely human, no merely corporate, no merely governmental, or political, or social authority, receiving the smallest permission from the Deity to decree that a single human soul should bow to its mandates, and not bow before the throne of the Eternal. And in confronting the Christian religion, which, without venturing to enter upon any of the conflicting views of the doctrine that may agitate large portions of the Christian world—without just now entering upon the controversy as between either Catholic, or Protestant, or Churchman, or Dissenter, or with the various religious dissenting denominations, one with the other—I think that all who accept the New Testament as a divine revelation of God's spiritual will to men, will agree with me in this simple declaration, that Christianity is, and ever will be, a personal matter between a man and his own God, and that the only instrumentality by which that religion can be distributed throughout the world, if we take the New Testament for our warrant and our guide, is by that spirit of Christian willinghood, by the force of that voluntary authority, which leaves all that profess to be inspired by its divine mandates and principles to make a sacrifice either in person or in pocket for its universal propagation; and attesting, in the face of all hostile influences, that they disbelieve in the arm of human law, or in the pomp and glory of the world, and place their exclusive trust in the might and power of those principles by which they profess to be guided. Now, sirs, to me it seems, tracing the history of the Christian Church from the day-dawn of its power until now, that every nation in which Christian organisations exist gives to us a melancholy proof of how prone mankind have been to depart from the simplicity of this faith, and in its propagation to put their confidence in forces that are alien to its character, and thoroughly opposed to its benignant spirit. Without wasting your time in attempting to illustrate in detail this most important fact—for the history of all nations, Protestant and Catholic alike, attests it—we may pass on to our own country as affording painful illustrations of a belief in force and coercion, in opposition to that spiritual instrumentality by which alone I believe the Gospel ought to be distributed throughout the world. This time last year, when I had the pleasure of addressing you in this place, I endeavoured to pourtray some of the

Fifteenth Series.—Price 1d., or 7s. per 100 for distribution.] [James Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row;

Of whom may be had "The Roman Catholic Question," Nos. I. to XIV.

struggles that had taken place in England, arising out of the fatal mistake made in this country, in the reign of Henry VIII., in the union commonly known under the phrase of the union of Church and State. I little dreamt at that time that the old controversy would present itself before us in so remarkable a shape as it does at the present time; for you will remember that I endeavoured to show you that while the Reformation, in the reign of Harry the Eighth, asserted the right of private judgment, and created a great political ecclesiastical revolution in this country—from the day of that establishment's birth down to the period when my Lord John Russell, within the walls of the House of Commons, was proposing, in speech at least, to endow the Irish Roman Catholic Church, I endeavoured to show you the conflicts sustained by our fathers—those conflicts which led them to maintain constantly those abstract principles of freedom to which I have just made reference, and which conflicts were absolutely necessary, not merely to obtain the right of meeting together in chapels for the worship of God, without the fear of persecution, but also for the repeal of many odious and bloody laws that endangered the lives and properties of the people; and for the repeal, also, of many iniquitous statutes that excluded a large mass of deserving men from the enjoyment of their political privileges, under a constitution that called itself a free constitution, and that professed to establish equal rights and equal justice for all. Now, sirs, we come to the time when, owing to the repeal of many of those absurd laws, the politicians of England witnessed the growth of two forces, both of which threatened their ancient ecclesiastical monopoly, unless a change took place in their tactics in relation to those who felt themselves aggrieved by the existence of the Established Church; and I well remember that six or seven years ago, when it was proposed in Parliament to endow the Irish Roman Catholic Church, I stood by the side of such men as John Burnett, of Camberwell, Edward Miall, of the *Nonconformist*, and some of the most earnest dissenting bodies who did not hold views on politics so extreme as those held by Mr. Miall and myself, and raised my voice against the proposition of the Ministry to endow the Irish Roman Catholic Church, as indicated by the proposed increased grant to Maynooth, not because the proposition was a proposition to endow a portion of the Roman Catholic people, but because the proposition was an addition to the endowment principle—a principle which has been at the root of the penal laws under which so many of the Puritans of England suffered imprisonment, banishment, and persecution—a principle which is the cause of forced levies for church-rates and tithes—a system which has commingled itself with almost all the political confusions of this country, and which many of us then foresaw would continue largely mingled in the future with all our political conflicts, unless the population could be persuaded to put its faith entirely in the power of the Gospel, and to put its faith entirely in the principles of human freedom, and demand an entire separation of Church and State. Now remember, gentlemen, for it is most important to remember this, that when the Maynooth Bill was debated, my Lord John Russell, who possesses a little bit of Catholic property, said, not in an actual legislative measure, but in the speech by which he supported the additional grant to Maynooth, that he supported that measure because one of the consequences of it necessarily was, that it would lead to the endowment of the Irish Roman Catholic Church; and I remember well that the renowned Colonel Sibthorpe, and other illustrious men of similar capacity, felt indignation that what they termed our glorious Protestant institutions were endangered from the suggestions of this Protestant minister. And when a number of us raised our voices in the country against this proposition, the Whig press called us fanatics—we were opposed, they said, to doing equal justice to our respectable Catholic fellow-countrymen; it was a miserable thing, they said, to oppose the grant to Maynooth, and a still more miserable thing to find fault with any statesmanlike proposition for endowing the Irish Roman Catholic Church, because, as they beautifully said, Ireland was not England; and that there might be enlightened measures of state policy that should be adopted, despite the fanaticism of Dissent, or the distaste of the more bigoted portion of the Protestant public. And you may remember further, that when the general election took place, several of our men who went to the poll, Joseph Sturge at Leeds, and other men, on the very question of resisting this tendency of the Whig Government to revert upon us the ancient system of ecclesiastical despotism by entering into partnership with another, so alarmed were the Whigs lest many of our men should triumph, that they coalesced with the Tories, voting one and one, in order to put out the men who were supposed to be earnestly opposed to this portion of their policy. Now, sirs, an incident has occurred that has changed entirely the under-working of the plot. The Pope has issued a bull; the Pope being—and if there are Roman Catholics present they must not be angry with me, because I want to strike all parties in turn, not with a view to found an argument opposed to the liberties of England, but to defend the religious freedom of every section of the people of England—the Pope being himself a person who cannot take care of himself, of whom we may say that he requires the aid of an army of which I am obliged to say that it has no more religion than an oyster, to keep him sustained upon the throne of Rome. And it certainly is a most astonishing fact that the bull of that shaly prince should have created such a dreadful revolution in the policy of our facetious friends—the Whigs. Now, gentlemen, with reference to Popery, there is no Catholic priest will suspect me of being a Jesuit—if Dr. Cumming were here, perhaps he might think I was one, but I don't think the mass of the people who know anything of my principles will suspect me of leaning towards what I regard as being the essential element of

the Catholic religion. I venerate too much the individualism of man, and glory too much in the dominancy of individual thought, to believe in any system that conglomerates mankind, and casts the human intellect prostrate before its power. I won't admit that his Serene Highness the Pope monopolises that material. I think at present we are called upon to define Popery; and I define Popery to mean this: a departure from the spiritual purity of religion, and the use of force to propagate religious opinions. If Popery does not mean this, it does not mean anything; for if you met a nervous gentleman to-day, who says to you "Don't you think the Pope will take away our Protestantism?" it is clear that he is alarmed lest some force should be exercised that would deprive him of his individual freedom, and last, under the cover of this despotical authority, principles might be forcibly distributed which he deems to be fatal to the purity of religion. Now, gentlemen, the one great defence made by those who believe in Church establishments is, that unless you have a Church establishment you would have no bulwark strong enough to resist the advances of what they call Popery; that unless you had a strong legal power in England, you would be inundated with false views of religion; that what is termed the voluntary principle would only open the way to discord, divisions, and confusions, in the midst of which the Popish power would come in and destroy the civil liberties of the people, and the energy of our Protestant propaganda. But I ask you, my countrymen, in the spirit of candour, to notice just one fact; that no one has charged the voluntary principle with entering into a conspiracy to advance Popish doctrines or practices—no one has charged the Independents with a design to restore the Catholic faith in England, no one has charged the Baptists with conspiring towards a similar end; no one has affirmed that the Wesleyan Methodists, or the Primitive Methodists, or the Plymouth Brethren, or the Presbyterians, or the Unitarians, or any body of religionists in this country sustaining themselves by the voluntary principle, with having entered into a league either to enslave the intellect or degrade the soul; but precisely in the Church as by law established, and nowhere else—within the walls of the very institution that was put up, we are told, to guard the purity of our Protestant faith, and to save the civil and religious liberties of England—precisely there, and nowhere else, upon the testimony of evangelical clergymen, upon the testimony of large public meetings, upon the testimony of fat aldermen who carry four chins, upon the testimony of Lord John Russell's letter—we have the Church of England charged with being no one knows what, but a kind of minister to Jesuitry and Popery—a kind of conspiracy against intellect and freedom; and, if this be so, if we find another danger near us, as these statesmen allege, another power trying to grapple at something supposed to be possessed by the other—I say, let us remove the bone of contention by severing the Church and State. Sirs, you must not be angry with me if I read you a little poem: it is entitled—

MOTHER CHURCH AND THE CHERRY-TREE.

See those cherries! how they cover
Yonder sunny garden wall!
Had they not this network over,
Thieving birds would eat them all.

So, to guard our Church and pensions,
Ancient sages wove a net,
Through whose holes of small dimensions
Only certain birds can get.

Shall we, then, this network widen?
Shall we stretch those sacred holes,
Through which e'en already slide in
Certain small dissenting souls?

"Heaven forbid!" Old Testy crieth;
"Heaven forbid!" so echo I—
Every ravenous bird that lieth
Then would at our cherries fly.

Ope but half an inch or so,
And behold how birds do break in!
How some curst old Popish crow
Pops his long and liquorish beak in.

There Sociuans flock unnumbered,
Independents slim and spare;
Both, with small belief encumbered,
Slip in easy anywhere.

Methodists, of birds the aptest
Where there's picking going on,
And that water-fowl, the Baptist—
All would have our fruits anon.

Every bird of every city,
That for years with ceaseless din
Hath reversed the Hastings ditty,
Singing out, "I can't get in."

If less costly fruit wou't suit them—
Hips and haws, and such like berries—
Curse the cormorants! stov'e them! shoot them!
Anything to save the cherries!

[The above verses were read amid excessive laughter and applause.] I feel to-night that we have cherries to save as well as other people, and that this question presented to us is one of immense importance to the religious liberties of every class of the people of England. The Church of England, as I have said, presents this night a divided aspect. There is his Grace the Bishop of London, and his Grace the Bishop of Oxford, and his Grace the Bishop of Exeter. It would be impossible for anyone to affirm in what these worthies differ from the Pope of Rome, except in the power to give effect to their mandates. But, gentlemen, the Pope's bull, having worked a most extraordinary revolution, has induced Lord John Russell to write a letter which, I think, will involve him in very great difficulties in the future, because the Pope's bull question is a very simple question after all. If the bull invades in the slightest degree the temporal rights of the Crown, or the civil rights of the people of England, there are deputies, let them plead; there are laws, let those laws be put in force. But I do not think it simply the part of the Prime Minister of the country, however intense his Protestantism may be, to use the station and influence he possesses to brand one section of the people of England with opprobrious and scornful names. No, sirs, though I would defend Protestantism, and Protestant principles, with all the energy of my nature, I would defend those principles by fair and lawful weapons; I would not, in the presence of my fellow-countrymen, do evil that good might come. And it does seem to me that there is something suspicious in this sudden change in the policy of Lord John Russell that should induce the people of England to ask themselves, seriously and soberly, in what precise direction these statesmen desire the gale of public opinion to blow; because it may turn out that these statesmen desire that gale to blow in a direction adverse to the religious freedom, not of one section of the people, but of many sections of the people of England. Undoubtedly for the past twenty years, the general tendency of the active mind of England has been against the long continuance of Church establishments. What has been the meaning of the many contests that have taken place in England to resist the payment of church-rates? What has been the meaning of our anti-state-church associations, and other organisations to obtain perfect religious freedom? They have all indicated the growth, in the minds of the active part of the people, of that sentiment that sometimes takes practical shape in demanding the separation of Church and State; and it has long been the opinion of thoughtful men, that unless some reaction, some change, takes place in the opinions of the active-minded portion of the people of England, one of two things must be done: either there must be a revival of the old penal laws in one shape or another, or the entire separation of Church and State. Now, sirs, the advance towards the endowment of the Catholics in Ireland was an attempt, I believe, to bribe over the Catholic population to sustain the dominant Church establishment. How that proposition failed, it is not for me to say. Whether the Catholics in Ireland refused to permit the Church establishment to monopolise the lion's share of the tithes and the church-rates, whatever may have been the cause of the failure, I can but congratulate you that the failure is manifest. For although at the present moment a loud outcry may be raised in England, a cry merely of "No Popery," I believe that beneath that cry, deeply down beneath that cry, there is existing an earnest and intelligent opinion that will soon take practical shape in such a way as to lead to a right solution of this most important problem. The question, however, for the Dissenting and voluntary portion of the people of England is, how shall we act in the presence of the agitation that now prevails throughout England? And in order to thoroughly understand the difficulty of the present position, let us look at the position Dissent has always occupied in the presence of the Established Church. It is all very well, gentlemen, to praise these Dissenters. They were praised before, as I remember showing you before in my last lecture on the Commonwealth. At the time when James II. was trying to put his foot upon the episcopacy, we know that the bishops and clergy raised a cry of "The good Dissenters! the loyal Dissenters! the respectable, the reputable, the intelligent, the pious Dissenters, our dear brethren!" Everyone remembers the tactics that were then played out. The Revolution swept away the Stuart dynasty, but when the new dynasty was firmly established, and the Dissenters in their terror acquiesced in the enactment of penal laws to suppress the Roman Catholic population, those laws were like bats with two handles, they struck the Catholic church on the right, and the Dissenting chapel on the left. In fact, the legislators thoroughly understood the art of what they called killing two birds with one stone. Gentlemen, it was all to save them from the horrors of Popery; and many a Dissenter at that time, like a worthy Dissenter at Colchester the other day (I should like to have his portrait!), said, that if the Church wished it, as a Dissenter, he should

be very glad to part with a portion of his liberties for a time. Meek-spirited man! Interesting specimen of an Englishman! Many were the men of this stamp, I say, that permitted to be rivetted upon the neck of England those absurd and atrocious laws that require the energy and toil of many a long year effectually to obliterate, effectually to brush away. Gentlemen, the Dissenting population at the present moment holds, if I may so speak, the key to all our ecclesiastical difficulties; but if the Dissenting population rushes on to the top of the platform with "our deeply-respected friend the vicar," or any other "worthy and respected friend," however good and amiable he may be in private life, but who holds thoroughly to the notion that his Church is the real Church, and the Church that ought to be exclusively supreme, those difficulties will be increased instead of being removed. And remember, not one iota of the old pretensions of the Established Church have been laid aside. The Dissenting minister to-day is not regarded by the clergy of the Church of England as a properly ordained minister. The Dissenting minister to-day is not regarded as a minister that lawfully dispenses the ordinances of baptism or the Lord's Supper. The Church of England to-day does not acknowledge the validity of Dissenting baptisms, either of adults or in infants; and to-day there are many ministers who would refuse to bury a child baptised out of the Established Church; proving to us, that the doctrine of Popery, or infallibility, is not confined to Rome, but extends to other parts of the world. I say, also, that the clergy of the Church of England to-day, whatever they may profess in their zeal and liberality, are the ministers of a Church which, if the terror of Popery subsided, would induce them again to feel that one part of their duty is to remove from the country, as rapidly as possible, those dangerous meeting-houses in which schism, and heresy, and sedition, and all kinds of dangerous teachings, are made popular. Now, it does seem to me, that the place for a Dissenter is not by the side of men who hold those doctrines, and defend them. Of course, I pronounce no verdict upon the gentlemen who choose to take a contrary course. I believe in the right of private judgment, and every man must, of course, take that stand which his conscience tells him to be right. But, gentlemen, we are bound to be at the present crisis unusually upon our guard, for it seems that the Dissenting population is expected to declare, as though it were a suspected population, that it is sound in its Protestant principles. Why, gentlemen, only think of a Dissenting minister standing up and declaring that he is a Protestant! Whoever says that he was not? There is no necessity for making the declaration. Every Dissenting chapel you see is a monument in favour of Protestantism; and the people who are in it have protested against two popes—Pope and prelate. It may be useful and proper for a Dissenting population to take its own dissenting stand, and point out what it believes to be the root of error in religious matters, and to point out what it believes to be the root of evil in political and ecclesiastical questions also. But simply to declare, because the vicar declares it, that it goes against Popery—to declare, after all its sufferings, and sorrows, and triumphs, that it must go to the Queen for assistance against the Pope—to declare to-day, that it has lost faith in its voluntary principle, that it no longer relies in that power to beat back the penal laws, and that shook from its shoulders that load of injustice which past tyrannies had heaped upon it—to declare to-day, with the printing-press in full operation, with the chapels studding over the country, with the vast array of teachers of Sunday-schools, with the pulpit increasingly active, with newspapers at its disposal, and with the spread of liberal opinions in the world—to declare to-day, that it fears Popery, and must go to the law for assistance, is to come down from its high pedestal, and to trample its principles beneath its feet. No, my countrymen; the energy of Protestantism lies in its voluntary power. The energy of Protestantism lies in its doing unto others as it wished others to do unto it. The energy of Protestantism lies in its repudiating the faggot, the thumb-screw, the law, the mandates of human princes; and though the syren may whisper in its ear, and may try to seduce it from the path of duty; though that corrupter may say,—Listen, listen to the voice of the charmer; acknowledge the Queen's supremacy in order to strike the Papist—if it does this, as sure as there is a just God in heaven, retribution will come upon Dissent; for the very supremacy that strikes the Papist will one day strike the Dissenter. Why, sirs, what are we afraid of? The Pope? Can the Pope's bull increase the number of Catholics? Has any man in Rochdale been converted by the bull of the Pope? Is there a single lady present alarmed lest she be roasted in Smithfield? I know very well that a large number of people who have no faith in the voluntary principle, who deride it, mock it, do all in their power to declare that they regard it as a scornful thing, I know these people will chuckle if they find Dissent, in terror, abandoning that voluntary principle, and nestling themselves, like a chicken in a storm, under the wing of the first fowl that they can get stretched over them. They will say, "Where are the Dissenters now? We have frightened them with the Pope, we have shaken the old rod over them; church-rates for ever, my boys! After this, all we shall have to do will be to frighten them with this Pope of Rome, who has established a hierarchy and spread his network over the country, and we shall induce them to acquiesce in the policy of maintaining our system, because we can turn round to the Dissenters and say, 'In your time of peril we preserved you; in your time of danger we protected you. This very system against which you have protested in your meeting became your friend, notwithstanding your long ingratitude, proving the kindness of its nature and its willingness to return good for evil.'" Now, gentlemen, can understand why many of the Church clergy

should be anxious, on the present occasion, to protest. It is quite natural for the Bishop of London to call his clergy together, and say, "Avoid all unseemly practices;" perfectly natural that the worthy bishop who had *consecrated*—I think the phrase is *consecrated* (which is, of course, not a Popish thing, but a Protestant principle)—he who had consecrated St. Barnabas—I can well understand how the Bishop of London should call the clergy together and recommend caution, great prudence, circumspection, proper regard for Protestant principles and prejudices. Yes, I can quite, I say, understand why the Bishop should do this; because everybody was saying, "What do you think of the Bishop of London?" He was a suspected man. Then, too, there is the Bishop of Oxford—look at his protest the other day: "Samuel, by the grace of God Lord Bishop of Oxford, in the name of the most holy Trinity, amen;" with a perfect Popish style, imitating, almost to the letter, the bull of the Pope, and merely charging the Pope with schism. Why, it is an acknowledgment downright that the two Churches are sister and brother, or mother and daughter, or that they held some relation, instead of a hearty affirmation of the principles of the Reformation. An attempt is made to show that the Pope is guilty of schism. The Pope can answer, "You are as schismatic as I am. If you had agreed with me, there would have been no schism." It is no use bandying about charges of this kind. Protestantism is either right or wrong; and if it is right, I am sure it must be as much opposed to the Bishop of Oxford as it is to the Pope of Rome. Well, then, look again, there is the Bishop of Exeter; he was a little more consistent; he gives them very cautious advice, and compliments the evangelical people as being the cause of all the mischief. In fact, gentlemen, in spite of the Prayer-book, in which every word is put properly down, so that no man may slip in saying one word not authorised, there is plenty of difference of opinion. You cannot even agree about the meaning of certain phrases, but you want a convocation to decide the matter, not content with the common-sense view of the question long held by numbers of the laity. Well, then, I say, I don't wonder that the Puseyite clergymen and some of the evangelical clergymen should be very anxious to meet their friends and neighbours. They say to their wives and families, "My dears, we must do something. You see there's that Pope's bull. It has thrown everything into confusion. It was all very well to permit Puseyism to go on playing its games in the presence of the people, but this Pope's bull has stirred up such a feeling of suspicion in the minds of the laity that it is quite necessary we should come forward and make declarations in favour of the great principles of the Reformation, nail our colours to the mast, and declare to the people we will stand by them through thick and thin in defence of our Protestant principles." This is perfectly right; and every man can understand it; but why should the Baptist minister get on the platform and say, "I am suspected?" or why should the Independent minister—why should our Churchmen do it—mount up by the side of the clergyman and say, "I wish all the world to believe I am a Protestant; my fathers were Protestants, and my children are all brought up Protestants, and Protestants I hope we shall die?" Why, gentlemen, there is nothing in it. It really signifies nothing; and yet the protest in itself may be useful, as showing the people of England that there is a power in public opinion before which even these clergy find themselves compelled to bow. But, sirs, when this cry takes the shape of Protestants against religious liberty, then it is that the people of England are bound to put themselves upon their guard; for, if the cry that now passes throughout England is not, in many mouths, an attack upon civil and religious freedom, I do not comprehend its meaning. Protests! Why, gentlemen, the protests delivered are perfectly harmless, unless they are to take legislative action; and I take it that no law exists to touch the present Archbishop of Westminster—I think he calls himself. I never bother myself much about these titles—I regard them altogether as the curse of Christianity, and the bane of the world; but, gentlemen, there seems to be no law in existence strong enough to touch this archbishop, or the law, of course, would have been put in force. Have a care, then, lest in the cry against the Pope the Parliament may be induced to pass some law which, while it professes to guard the civil supremacy of the throne, shall really increase and render more formidable its ecclesiastical and religious power. Gentlemen, this is the danger that we are in at the present moment. No Englishman, of course, would submit to any foreign prince having power in these islands to touch the liberties or the properties of the people of England. But to protest on a question like this is rank absurdity; the thing has no meaning. I believe the Catholic population, equally with the Protestant, would resist any attempt at temporal domination in this country; but if it be true that the Catholic population cannot worship in its chapels without the use of bishops, if it be true that, in order to perfect the Emancipation Act, it is necessary to give them permission to have their own bishops and their own priests and their own clergy, why, gentlemen, in the name of religious liberty, so long as they do not *tax* the people of England to maintain that form of faith, so long as they do nothing to resist the civil power, so long as they do not put themselves in opposition to the laws which guard our persons, our properties, and our lives and liberties, I say the Catholic population have just as much right to manage their own chapels and cathedrals as any other body of religionists. Sirs, we must not be misled by the saying, "But they are Catholics!" Well, it is perfectly true, they are Catholics; but, remember, they are citizens of England, and we have no right to treat loyal men, until they give us proof of their disloyalty, as though they were bad, profligate, and corrupt citizens. It is

unfair, my countrymen, it is dishonourable, it is making use of a prejudice to wound the sacred cause of freedom. I say, and say with deep seriousness, that if Protestantism cannot stand without the aid of arbitrary laws, let Protestantism perish. For certainly it would be a proof to me that Protestantism was not a thing in accordance with the Divine will, and that it did not realise the great end at which religion and intelligence aim. Countrymen, the Catholic population just now are made the scapegoats of a party that has always been opposed to civil and religious freedom. Who are the principal men engaged in some of the public meetings, declaiming against the Pope? Men who resisted the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—men who resisted Catholic emancipation—men who were opposed to the Reform Bill—men who resisted Free-trade. All classes of re-actionists troop to that standard, because they think it is the standard under which the largest amount of the nation's prejudices and the nation's fears will be rallied; and I confess that, although I perceive many excellent men standing under that standard, I have no confidence in the policy propounded, and I have no confidence in the leading men who take part in that agitation. Gentlemen, if anything could disgrace the Dissenting population of England at the present moment, it would be their taking part, in large numbers, in favour of a re-enacting of the penal laws. It would be, gentlemen, to bring upon them lasting, enduring disgrace. It would be, gentlemen, to induce the enlightened part of the people of England to regard the Dissenters with scorn, and to cause their name to be a by-word and a reproach throughout the continent of Europe. Have we a right to declaim against the Pope, because he will not permit the circulation of the Scriptures, if we imitate him in his own tyranny? Have we a right to declaim against the arbitrary conduct of other Governments, if we imitate their own arbitrary examples? No! Let us, however trying it may be, affirm in the presence of the Government, and the world, that though the cry of "No Popery" now rings in our ears, we do not believe that Popery is more dangerous when seen than when unseen. We believe that when we see that which is dangerous, we have all the more power to cope with it. Let us tell the Government that the history of the past 300 years proves to us that coercion and oppression could not suppress the Catholic faith. We tried it in Ireland, but there are more Catholics to-night in Ireland than there were at the time, compared with Protestants, when the Protestant Church, as by law established, was called into being. Let us tell the Government that instead of fearing that Popery will grow, we put our confidence in the intelligence of the population; we put our confidence in the spread of scriptural knowledge; we put our confidence in the power of comprehending principles, and in the growth of freedom, which is common, not to England alone, but to the entire world. Let us turn our Government's attention to France, and Germany, and Italy, and ask that Government how it is that in those three districts of Europe, in spite of the long existence of Roman Catholicism, in spite of the immense force possessed by that faith, that Catholicism upon the Continent declines; that Catholicism is powerless against the advance of science, powerless against the advance of intelligence, and against the advance of democratic ideas; so powerless that it could not prevent the French Revolution; that it cannot prevent the diffusion of biblical principles in Germany; that it could not prevent the Roman population from expelling the Pope from Rome? Let us ask, then, if these things have taken place upon the continent of Europe, and if the Pope this night is dependant upon foreign bayonets—if it be true, as every man of sense knows it is true, that the smallest up-turning, either in France or Germany—an up-turning that is very likely to take place before many weeks go over our heads—that the Pope himself may be a fugitive and a wanderer, flying perhaps to England for that succour which the Roman Catholic population of Europe in arms have denied him. Sirs, it is a farce to suppose that Popery—meaning a departure from religious truth, and the use of force to sustain it—that this Popery can be put down by law. Suppose you were to re-enact the penal laws to-morrow, what would it do? Why, that would crowd every Catholic Chapel; for every man of pluck would say, "I will not submit to this;" and you create an enthusiasm in favour of the very thing that you desire to destroy. If you want to double the power of the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, make a martyr of him. Summon him before the civil courts, and prosecute him. The true way to treat titles is to treat them with contempt. What man of sense in this country ever feels his heart bumping against his ribs when his neighbour says to him, "There's the Lord Bishop of London?" He would merely turn round his head and say, "Bless me! Is that him? He's not so fat as I thought to see him." We know the existence of these people does not give the Church of England power. They merely give it money-power, not a great spiritual and moral power, or else the nonconformist congregations would not have existed in their present bulk. The way really to damage a system in the eyes of thinking men is to tinsel it over. Give it an additional number of titles, Saint Prudentia, or Saint Anything-else, the populace will only shrug their shoulders. No, sirs; altogether, the notion that Popery or any other system can be defeated by these means is an insult to the intelligence of the people of England. But when a number of people upon the platform cry, "Beware! beware! There's some unseen power; you don't see it, I know you don't; but it's there—it will be upon you by night or by day;" they only alarm timid men and women, who can scarcely sleep at night, to such a miserable state are they reduced; and the sound of a cat upon the staircase makes them think a priest is in the house. But such terror only strikes the mind of

the timid and the weak. The stout man, the man who walks upon Protestant principles, who does not depend upon an Act of Parliament, who does not wait to know what the bishop thinks, but demands to take the Scriptures into his own hand, and express his own thoughts fervently before the footstool of his Maker—such a man is not afraid of pope, or bishop, or cardinal, or law; he walks independent of their authority, and will not bow himself to their mandates. Gentlemen, you cannot captivate these men by titles, because you must always bear in mind the old, trite, though somewhat vulgar adage, that old birds are not to be caught with chaff. The young ones are; but old people are the more awake and all the more wary. If they have obtruded upon them any power that professes a desire to take away their independence—if it be true that there is a conspiracy to take the Bible out of the hands of the people, and to deprive them of education and of liberty, all strong-minded men and women would resist, would “scorn,” as Lord John Russell phrases it, any power of this kind; and the unwary you can never deliver from the approaches of those who are subtle and designing, until you have distributed amongst them that education, that knowledge, that will put them upon their guard. But, sirs, supposing you obtain penal laws to-morrow—suppose Lord John Russell finds that the pilot-balloons creating political capital in the shape of the breath of public opinion takes—supposing he introduces a law which interferes with the religious liberties of the Catholic people, will you then be delivered from his Holiness the Pope? Will your Protestantism then be any safer than it is to-night? If it be true that Jesuits swarm everywhere—if they are in the church, and behind the counter, and on board ship, and in the coalpits, and that you cannot walk anywhere without having the ghost of a Jesuit looming somewhere through the atmosphere—if he has such an impalpable power to-day, he'll have it then; he will change his shape, I fancy, and put on another disguise, and become all the more competent for the fulfilment of his designs in an unseen manner than he would be if he openly paraded his army before you. I would rather see the Jesuits ranged in order upon Blackheath, than distributed privately throughout the land. You cannot put down a power like this by law. You can only reason it down, argue it down, force it down by the domination of superior principles. I seem to me that as a matter of policy the Dissenting population can never take part with those who are endeavouring to revive the penal laws—first of all, because they would wound their own principles, disgrace their own character, put into the hands of the civil magistrate a power that could strike the chapel as effectively as it could strike the Catholic cathedral; and they would then have the painful knowledge, when this policy succeeded, that they had done nothing to retard the advancement of Catholicism; that the power that resisted the penal laws before can resist them now; and that in this age, when sympathy always runs with the persecuted, the chances would be a thousand to one that Catholicism would be strengthened instead of weakened by the policy themselves had consummated. But, sirs, you would do more; you would strengthen the power that has always arrogated to itself the right to become dominant in England. I know not whether here are Churchmen, Dissenters, or Catholics before me, but I will venture to speak plainly and honestly to you. I believe that the connexion between Church and State is the root of all the confusions that exist at the present moment. Yes, gentlemen, how is it that in America, where there is no Established Church, and where the Pope has issued a bull, the Yankees have not thrown themselves into fits of terror? All America does not run mad and say, “The Pope will take our Protestantism away. Don't you think it is a serious thing that the Pope interferes with our civil rights? I guess it will be dangerous to the future condition of American liberty.” No; and why? Because there are no loaves and fishes to struggle for. No doubt the appetite of the Catholic archbishop must be whetted a little in the presence of so many good things as are enjoyed by the Church of England; and we can now say to the Church of England, and the Church of England itself will not be angry with it, that inasmuch as in that Church we see people tending directly to Rome, and it is the only Church suspected of Popish practices and Popish opinions at the present moment, we say in a firm but temperate manner, that you constitute the centre of that great reaction towards Rome which you are constantly denouncing; and your enormous wealth, maintained and created at the expense of the people, constitutes a temptation to any other Papacy that strives to imitate your dominant ideas. Gentlemen, this is the point at issue; but it is the point from which they will endeavour to drive us. They will say to us, “Don't mind church-rates, don't mind ecclesiastic abuses; think of the Pope, my countrymen! think of the Pope! You would not have the Pope, would you?” and these appeals will certainly tell in many quarters; but I trust they will not tell with sober-minded and intelligent men and women. Tell them you want to put down the essence and spirit of Popery. Tell them that the right of private judgment is the great basis of all Protestant opinion. Tell them that these principles induce you to protest against the assumptions of the Established Church with as much earnestness as you can protest against the assumptions of the Pope. Tell them that when you see a man entering the house of one to take his chairs and tables away in the name of that religion which is mercy, and peace, and love, and justice, and charity towards all men—tell them you see they are a type of the Papacy, hideous to contemplate, dangerous to the institutions of religion, and subversive of the liberties of the people of England. Tell them that at the present moment, when the farmers are engaged in discussing the question of their burdens, in consequence of the pressure that is upon them,

that you regard the tithing system as at present existing in England, as savouring, too, of these Popish practices which the Church of England itself denounces. Tell them this, gentlemen, and the cry of "No Popery" will have been made in vain. It will have swept over the country, arousing first the attention of the population to questions of a religious and ecclesiastical character; but when once aroused, the strong patriots and the true-hearted men will come to turn the current of this great controversy into the right channels. It is my most earnest desire that my countrymen at the present crisis do nothing to wound their characters, or to destroy that illustrious reputation won for them by the zeal and martyrdom of their forefathers. Religious freedom signifies, not the right of one sect at the expense of another sect, but it signifies the right of all sects and parties to propagate their views, whatever they may be. It means the right, not of Christians alone, but of the infidel, of the Jew, and of the Mahomedan—the right of all sects and parties, without any fear of the law, to put forward their opinions, so long as they are peaceable and loyal citizens—so long as they feel the civil obligations which the State has a right to demand at their hands. Gentlemen, we have just approached the time when it becomes us to take this stand. If we do not do it, the result of the exertions of the past thirty years may be entirely thrown away—the result of all the toil and labour of our forefathers will go for nought. If we once throw down that splendid superstructure of religious freedom, reared by the hands of our forefathers, we shall deserve nothing but the execration of posterity. Gentlemen, let us brace our nerves up, then, and contemplate calmly the present posture of public affairs. Let us tell our fellow-countrymen that we believe that Dissenters ought to preserve, as far as they can, a dignified silence in the presence of the controversy between the Papal archbishop and the Protestant bishop. Let us tell them that we will not lift a finger or a hand to rivet a single chain upon the liberties of our Catholic countrymen. Let us tell them, that, putting our trust in the principles of Protestantism, we will redouble our exertions to scatter abroad those principles of truth which we believe to be fully competent for the fulfilment of all the purposes that Protestantism has in view. Gentlemen, shall we doubt the Christian religion? Shall we become infidel to its principles and its power? Has that religion no recorded triumphs to call us back to our allegiance, and to bid us remember our fealty to it, and to regard its majestic triumphs even in the day-dawn of its power? Look at the splendid passage in its life, the passage that immediately follows the apostolical times. Why, countrymen, in those days, when the civil powers of the world were leagued against the faith, and the arm of persecution was constantly put forth to smite it, Christianity was a persecuted and despised, but still a powerful thing. It wrestled manfully with the scornful Jew; it gained a throne for itself in the midst of the Grecian philosophy, and confronted the wisdom of its sages, not by seizing the arm of human law, but by the sword of the spirit, which is more powerful than the authority of princes. It confronted the armies of power; it breasted the energy of their hostile influences, until it assumed for itself a spiritual authority and influence which began to leaven the entire of human society. And I say for this holy faith, that never did it achieve triumphs so glorious, that never did it assert the divinity of its nature in so triumphant a manner, as when it marched through the dungeon, and over the scaffold, and through the flame, and over the rack, defying the arms of civil power, and proclaiming eternally to the world, that all that Christianity needs is to display her own lovely attributes to subdue the world to her authority, and to mould it to her will. Go back from Christianity now because the bench of bishops bid us? No, countrymen! we should indeed be traitors to the principles that our forefathers have conferred upon us. The history of prelatical domination in England has been written in letters of blood upon the historical life of our country. What mean those conflicts that occurred in England in the reigns of Mary, Elizabeth, and James? What was the power that then sought to strangle the Puritan energy of England? It was the power of the prelates. Those lordly men, gentlemen, had usurped all authority in Church and State; and, not content with their spiritual domination, conspired, and re-conspired, until the storm of the Commonwealth, to raise the Church above the laws, and make it supreme alike over the civil and ecclesiastical liberties of the people. Tell them, then, sternly and majestically tell them, of that holy band of men whose memories on a former occasion I endeavoured to revive in your presence—of the logical and eloquent protests of our Sydneys and Seldens—of the legal research of our Pym, Cokes, Hampdens—of the fervent piety and high-souled courage of our Cromwells—of the majestic and beautiful, the more than sublime genius of a Milton: all these men have consecrated themselves, more or less, in protests as much against the dominancy of the prelate as against the corruption of the Pope. To suppose that now, because some trumpery piece of paper has invested a dozen or more men with mere trumpery titles, we are to turn our backs upon the memories of those sainted leaders—that we are to re-adore the memory of Archbishop Laud—that we are to revive the memory of the cursed Star Chamber—makes my blood boil with indignation. Whoever are the men to bear this insult, I for one will be a free man. Whoever will stoop down in the presence of this mania, I for one will raise my voice against it. In no sycophancy, even to the people—with no fond desire to conciliate Catholicism where I

believe Catholicism to be wrong, and in the name of that liberty which is superior to sect, which knows nothing of party, which is not one-sided, and which never can depart from man so long as man professes to be guided by its authority—in the name of that liberty I will go forth, trying to rally my fellow-countrymen to the rescue of the one grand thought which must be uppermost in the minds of Englishmen, until we finally achieve the entire separation of Church and State. Sirs, this is the one, sole, supreme idea that must be maintained in these theological discussions. No more Popes; no more prelates; no more taxes levied upon one man to sustain the creed of another; no right on the part of the State to persecute and brand any citizen who discharges in a peaceable way the duties the State devolves upon him. For, gentlemen, there are questions in England, important questions too, that certain men in this country would desire to shelve, if they could, under the wing of this No-Popery discussion. There is the question of Parliamentary Reform, which, by the way, would put down a good many Poperies if we could once get it settled. There are many men will be called now very intelligent, if they merely pass No-Popery resolutions; but I trust the working men will remember that, between the two rival hierarchies their interest is rather to look on and say, "Gentlemen, it is a very pretty quarrel as it stands." The working classes, the sensible working men, I am quite sure, will go to bed at night without feeling that the Pope can steal away their intellects; and if they are right-hearted working men, they will give their children such a sound education as to deliver them from the dominancy of all kinds of Popes. Then there is the question of financial reform—a very important question for our commercial and manufacturing classes; but who can press for financial reform when the country is "in danger from the Pope?" Oh, you will "be patriotic," you will "unite as the heart of one man against the foreigner;" and "when the foreign foe is destroyed, then we can attend to our own domestic matters." Surely you will stand stoutly out and "defend the supremacy of the throne in religious matters;" for it would indeed be cruel at the present moment, when such terrible danger overhangs our faith, from a man who, as I said before, is not able to take care of himself. And surely, you would not press upon the attention of the Government any merely material or political questions—for, of course, the Church will maintain in Parliament that this is not a question of materialism, when every man of sense in the country knows it to be a very *material* question, as far as the Church is concerned. And though this assertion may be made, it cannot for a single moment be kept from the minds of the people of England, that the question of money does largely mix itself with this discussion. What will our poor farmers do, if we don't come to their rescue in these large towns? I do not know what is to become of them for the next six or eight months. Their agricultural dinners will be full of nothing but Popes; Protection itself will be laid aside in the presence of a greater enemy than Free-trade. The landlords—those who are very much afraid of the growing radical tendency of the farmers, a tendency more and more developing itself in the southern and south-western counties—they will say, "You have always been patriotic men, loved your sovereign, and been defenders of our glorious constitution. You surely won't talk about cheap bread now? Farmers (though many of the farmers never heard of the Pope)! farmers! the Pope's at the door! the Pope! the Pope! the Pope!"—"Who's the Pope?" "Oh, such a man, you have no idea, but what is a general or a *lumpy* idea, of what the Pope is; but he has most enormous power, possesses more mysterious authority than any other man possesses for clawing people unseen away from their own opinions." [After proceeding a little further in this strain, Mr. Vincent exhorted the voluntaryists to rely upon their principles, as all-sufficient in every emergency, and deprecated any act of the Legislature which might tend to cripple religious liberty. He laid down and advocated the broad principles of political justice; exhorted his audience to be courageous, and concluded with the following words.] To-day, in the presence of intelligent people; to-day, in the presence of commercial and trading activity so mighty that it stands without a parallel, as contrasted with the past—to-day, with mighty armies of intelligence impregnated with thought and science, with the results of Christian teachings, to-day shall we trample upon the memory of those former glories? No! by the memory of those former struggles! No! by the memory of those sacred truths that God has implanted in the soul! This world will continue to rise. The din and clamour of the moment may obscure from the vision of the people that form of glory, that grand form of freedom, that looms before the eyes of the people in moments of calm and of reflection; the clouds of some State policy, of some ecclesiastical craft, may, for a few fleeting weeks or months, obscure the brilliancy of that eternal sun of glory and intelligence that constitutes humanity's luminary, constantly lifting it up to the contemplation of higher and higher agencies; but still the world will advance, until, ultimately, Pope and prelate, tyrant and priest, affrighted by the very Frankenstein's their own arts have called into being, will quail before them, and the majesty of truth and justice, of power and liberty, will hereafter be dominant; for God has decreed one great teaching, in which all the world may place its confidence, that Pope and prelate, and priest and tyrant, must fall, and that, upon the ruins of them all, effulgent with enduring glory, will rise higher and

higher, until the very heavens shall reflect again the majesty of God, and reflect upon the people that which the people must reflect towards the skies—the spiritual freedom, the intellectual liberty, and the political rights of all mankind.

ADDRESS TO CARDINAL WISEMAN.

On Saturday morning, December 21st, 1850, about thirty English Catholic noblemen and gentlemen assembled at the episcopal residence in Golden-square, for the purpose of presenting to Cardinal Wiseman an address which during the last fortnight has been in circulation, and has obtained the signatures of the principal Catholic families of England. Amongst those present were Lord Petre and Lord Dormer, the Hon. T. E. Stonor, the Hon. Charles Langdale, Sir Robert Throckmorton, Bart., Robert Gerard, Esq., Edmund Jerningham, Esq., C. de la Barre Bodenham, Esq., &c.

When the deputation had assembled, the Cardinal entered the room, and Lord Petre, advancing towards him, read the following address:—

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EMINENCE,—The arrival amongst us of your Eminence, bearing in your own person a distinguished proof of the paternal kindness of the Holy Father for this portion of his flock, and charged with the highest place in that Catholic hierarchy, the restoration of which we most gratefully welcome, affords of itself a sufficient occasion for us to offer to your Eminence the most respectful and most affectionate assurances of the gratitude we feel for the part which your Eminence has taken in this great work, and of the gratification with which we hail your return amongst us.

“An additional motive for thus publicly testifying these feelings is found in the misrepresentations that have prevailed, and in the unprovoked insults which have been offered to our Holy Father, and to your Eminence, on this, to us, most auspicious event.

“Your Eminence has nobly expressed your desire to stand between the Holy Father and the vituperation cast upon his act. In this generous rivalry we cannot consent to be omitted. We do not claim to share in the merit of reconstructing the Catholic hierarchy, but we will not forego our right to share in all the odium which has been excited by it.

“It is our ardent wish that our Holy Father, Pope Pius the Ninth, should be assured of the heartfelt gratitude which we feel towards him for the great blessing which he has bestowed upon us, in establishing the hierarchy in our beloved country. We therefore beg your Eminence to make known our sentiments to his Holiness, and to assure him, whilst as British subjects we yield to none in loyalty and attachment to our Sovereign, that as Englishmen we will assert our right to the free exercise of our religion, and that, as Catholics, under all circumstances, we will, by the aid of God, stand fast by the See of Peter.

“That your Eminence may long be spared to enjoy the dignities so deservedly conferred upon you, and that you may long continue to govern your Archiepiscopal See of Westminster, to the glory of God, the advancement of religion, and the salvation of the souls committed to your charge, is our most fervent prayer.”

When Lord Petre had concluded, the Cardinal returned the following answer:—

“My Lords and Gentlemen,—I cannot adequately express the feelings of gratification with which I receive this address of congratulation on the establishment of our hierarchy. Were it an expression only of kindness and attachment towards myself, I might be flattered by the public manifestation of sentiments of which I have had so many individual proofs. But far more do I value the declaration which you have here embodied, of much higher and more sacred feelings, those of inviolable fidelity to the great principles of our holy religion, and of filial love and reverence for our supreme and venerable pontiff. When, however, I see the names attached to this address, and know how many of them represent families as noble by ancestral religion as they are by their unblemished escutcheons—families which have remained faithful to God and to their Sovereign through ages of proscription, in spite of fine and confiscation—families which have proved their religious sincerity and steadfastness in the prison, as well as their unshaken loyalty in the field—I cannot be surprised at finding those who now bear those illustrious names at the head of the Catholic laity, when circumstances call them forward to avow their religious principles and their attachment to the Church. I have great pleasure in announcing that yesterday I received a letter from the Earl of Shrewsbury at Palermo, which proves how readily and cordially he would have joined his name to yours had he been amongst us. His lordship is enthusiastic in his expressions of satisfaction at what the Sovereign Pontiff has done. It will be to me a gratifying duty to lay at the feet of our Holy Father the expressions of your filial attachment, and of your gratitude for the restoration of our hierarchy, and to join to it my testimony that the Catholic laity of

England have been found equal to the crisis created through that event, by their zeal, devotedness, and noble bearing. And on my own behalf, again tendering to you my sincere thanks, I earnestly pray God to bestow on you and your families every temporal and an eternal blessing."

Amongst the signatures attached to the above address the following names appear:—

EARL—The Right Hon. the Earl of Newburgh.

VISCOUNT—Southwell.

LORDS—Stourton, Petre, Arundell of Wardour, Dorner, Stafford, Clifford, Lovat.

HONOURABLES—Thomas E. Stonor, George Mostyn, Simon Fraser, Francis Stonor, William Stourton, Philip Stourton, Charles Langdale, Albert H. Petre, William Stafford Jerningham, Charles Thomas Clifford, Henry Hugh Clifford, George Fraser.

BARONETS—Sir Edward Doughty, Sir Charles Wolsley, Sir Edward Blount, Sir Robert Throgmorton, Sir James Fitzgerald, Sir Henry Bedingfeld, Sir Edward Smythe, Sir Thomas Rokewood Gage, Sir Clifford Constable, Sir William Lawson, Sir Charles Tempest, Sir Thomas Joseph de Trafford.

MESSIEURS—Renfrick Arundell, Henry Arundell, Theodore Arundell.

Charles Bodenham, of Rotherwas; C. De la Barre Bodenham, of Rotherwas; Robert Berkeley, of Spelchley; Robert Berkeley, jun., of Spelchley; Swinburne Berkeley; Charles Berington, of Little Malvern; Anthony Wright Biddulph, jun., of Burton Park; T. H. Bowdon, of Southgate; Henry Bowdon, of Southgate; John Butler Bowdon, of Plessington-hall; Thomas Weld Blundell, of Ince Blundell; Michael H. Blount, of Maple Durham; John Blount, of Maple Durham; Walter Blount, Michael Joseph Blount, Walter Aston Blount, George Blount, Gilbert R. Blount; Charles Blount, of Usk; William Blundell, of Crosby-hall; J. Standidge Byron, of Westayton.

Edward Canning; W. H. Charleton, of Hesleyside; Francis Cholmeley, of Brandsby; George Clifford, of York; W. Clifford, L. Clifford, Thomas Clifton, Henry Clifton, Talbot Clifford Constable.

Ferdinand Eyston, of Overbury; John Eyston, of Welford.

Marmion E. Ferrers, of Badesley Clinton; John Fitzherbert, of Clifton; George Fitzherbert, Francis Fitzherbert, of Clifton.

J. Vincent Gandolfi, of Foxcolli; R. T. Gillow, of Leighton-hall; Robert Gerard.

H. M. Hawkins, of Usk; Compton J. Hanford, of Wollas-hall; John A. Herbert, of Llansatfraed; Arthur Herbert, Edmund Herbert, Washington Hibbert, of Bilton-grange; T. C. Hornyhold, of Blackmore-park; Philip H. Howard, M.P., of Corby-castle; James Hunloke, of Wingerworth; Edward Huddleston, of Sawston.

William Jones, of Clytha; Philip Jones, of Langattock; Edward Jones, of Clifton; Wyborne Jones, of Clifton; Edmund Jerningham; Arthur W. Jerningham.

James Kirsopp, of the Spittal.

Charles Langdale, jun., of Houghton; John Lawson, of Brough.

William Constable Maxwell, of Everingham; Peter Maxwell, of the Grove; Marquise Constable Maxwell, of Terregles; Henry Constable Maxwell, of Scarthingwell; Lieutenant-Colonel M'Donell, late 79th Highlanders; Peter Middleton, of Middleton-Lodge; John Middleton; Charles Middleton, Thomas Meynell, of Kilvington; Henry Mostyn; C. R. Scott Murray, of Danesfield.

A. Lisle Philipps, of Grace Dieu Manor; Charles Plowden, of Plowden.

Thomas Riddell, of Felton-park; John Rosson, of More Hall.

Walter Selby, of Biddlestone; Simon J. Scroope, of Danby; Henry Silvertop, of Minster Acres; Charles Stapleton; Thomas Molyneux Seel.

Henry Tempest; Charles Townely, of Townely; Henry Turvile, of Longbridge.

William Vaughan, of Courtfield; John Vaughan; William Vavasour, of Hazelwood Castle.

Edward Waterton, of Walton Hall; Joseph Weld, of Lulworth Castle; George Weld, of Leagram; James Weld, of Archer's Lodge; Humphrey Weld, of Chidlock; James Wheble, of Bulmershe Court; E. J. Weld, of Tawstock; George Whitgreave, of Mosely; Henry Whitgreave, Francis Whitgreave, Joseph Whitgreave; John T. Wright, of Kelvedon; William Wright; Edward Wright, of Richmond; Charles Wright, of Richmond; Thomas Wright.

SERGEANT-AT-LAW.—William Shee.

BARRISTERS.—H. R. Bagshawe, T. A. Cooke, George Bowyer, D.C.L., James Fleming, William Finely, Richard Dearsley, Henry Stonor, R. R. Pearce, William J. Amherst, Henry G. Bagshawe, Alfred F. Blount, John D. King, Henry Leeming, John E. Wallis, Alexander J. Mansfield, William Finlason (pleader).

ADDITIONAL NAMES.

Henry Barnewell, Michael Blount, jun., of Maple Durham; Arthur Blount, Stanley Cary, of Follaton; Richard Dyneley Chamberlain, Pedro de Zulucta, Edward Darell, of Cale-hill; Robert Darell, James E. Doyle, Henry Doyle, O'French Duff, John French Duff, Thomas Dunn, Robert Eyston, Lewis Joseph Eyre, William Gillow, of Clifton; Joseph Gillow, of Clifton; Edmund Gorman, William J. Lescher, Daniel Lec, of Manchester; Edward Leeming,

of Manchester; Charles Leeming, R. H. Manners, J. McDonald, Francis New, Thomas Norris, C. J. Pagliano, Edward Petre, of Dunkenhagh; Charles Riddell, E. Ryley, Bryan Stapleton, Charles Strickland Standish, of Standish; Simon Scroope, jun., of Danby; Edward Slaughter, S. Nasmyth, Edward Pegart, jun., Joseph Weld, jun., of Lulworth; Arthur Weld, of Leagrim; A. Walmesley, Edmund Wheble, of Clifton; William Wheble, T. Walmesley, T. E. Walmesley, H. W. Wilberforce.

THE ALLEGED AGGRESSION OF THE POPE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,—Will you allow a looker-on to say a few words on the subject that engages the public mind in England? I address you, as your paper is the most temperate of any that I see. A fortnight ago I could not have believed it possible that Englishmen could have uttered so much absurdity as I see they have. Still less could I have anticipated such deplorable ignorance as has been exhibited by men in high station in the Church. And least of all could I have dreamed of such a letter as has been penned by the Premier.

Living as I do in a country where the Pope's titular archbishops and bishops are everywhere to be met with, and knowing how completely their authority is limited to those within their respective territories who are willing to recognise it, I regard with extreme astonishment the commotion which has been excited by the recent act of the Pope. He is simply doing in England what his predecessors did in Ireland some two hundred and fifty years ago, and what others of his predecessors have from time to time done in the East. Unfortunately, the number of persons in England who are obedient to the papal authority has greatly increased of late years; partly, no doubt, by accessions from Protestantism, but chiefly by immigration from Ireland. It could not be supposed that the Pope would leave these persons destitute of a parochial clergy to take charge of them—that he would continue to the end of time the missionary establishments which sufficed when Romanists were but few in number. The introduction of the parochial system among English Romanists was a necessary consequence of the spread of Romanism in England; and the parochial system necessarily implies the diocesan system. English Protestants may not, indeed, see this last necessity, and some may perhaps think that Romish parish priests would be a good thing (of course, for Romanists only), but that Romish bishops are by no means to be tolerated. According to the Romish system, however (I speak advisedly), the existence of parish priests necessarily implies the existence of bishops—*bonâ fide* bishops of dioceses in England. The Pope might have assumed the same titles for the bishops of his new Church as were borne by the bishops of the old Church—that was the course adopted by his predecessors in Ireland. He has, however, rather chosen new sees; so that there can be no awkward confusion between the bishop of the original Church and the bishop of the new foundation, such as we are occasionally annoyed by in Ireland. Some cry out against this as an additional aggression. When people are displeased at a thing being done at all, it generally happens that they will complain of the manner in which it is done, as an aggravation of the evil. In such cases, however, I have often noticed that if a different manner had been chosen, there would have been a still greater cause of complaint. If the principal cities of London, Bristol, and Manchester had been taken for titles, in place of their subordinate adjuncts, Westminster, Clifton, and Salford, would the ground of complaint have been less? Would the Archbishop of London be a more tolerable title than the Archbishop of Westminster?

In Ireland we are used to these titulars, and we do not find their existence an insupportable evil. In the highest station of all, the newspapers lately announced that Archbishop Cullen, the Pope's newly-appointed primate, paid a visit to the primate at the Palace. Of course it was a friendly visit. I happen to know that the Primate used frequently to call for the late Archbishop Croll, and take him with him in his carriage to those charitable or other meetings which they could attend in common. The Archbishop of Dublin and Archbishop Murray are also in habits of friendly intercourse. And to go down in the scale, there is a "Catholic rector," as he calls himself, of the parish where I officiate. I claim that title as rightfully belonging to me, though I do not use it; but for all that, and though we may give one another some hard blows, or what we think to be such, in our respective pulpits, we are very good friends when we meet, and have no difficulty in acting in concert in matters of a temporal character. We of the Irish branch of the Church submit with a good grace to what we would wish otherwise, but what we have no power to prevent, and our brethren in England should do the same.

It is said, however, by many in England that, according to Catholic usage, there can be but one bishop in one territory; and that, accordingly, by the Pope's recent act he has ignored the existence of the bishops of our Church, and treated us as no longer Christians. It seems a strange assertion that the recent allocution ignores the existence of our bishops, when the new titles selected for the new bishops were evidently chosen with a view not to interfere

with the old ones. It seems also rather strange to affirm that the sending of missionaries from Rome to England, with bishops of places in Asia or Africa to preside over them as vicars of the Pope, was a treating of England as Christian and a recognition of her hierarchy. But is it not contrary to Catholic order for there to be two bishops in one place? No doubt it is; but this Catholic order was violated at a very early period; and the violations of it have been so numerous that a new instance of its violation can scarcely deserve a remark. If the English Church had been herself free from blame in this matter, she might have had some pretence for crying out against others; but how stands the case? When Canada was surrendered to Great Britain, it possessed a regular hierarchy in communion with the Pope; and this hierarchy was acknowledged by the British Government. Nevertheless, in course of time, the English Church sent over a Bishop of Quebec; and we have since had a Bishop of Montreal; and within the last year the diocese has been divided, and we have bishops of both Quebec and Montreal. In this instance our bishops have taken the titles of the existing sees in communion with the Pope. The English Church has acted with respect to Canada exactly as the Pope acted with respect to Ireland. In the case of Malta she acted differently. She sent a bishop there; but as there was a Bishop of Valetta already, she called him the Bishop of Gibraltar, and assigned him a cathedral there, as well as at Valetta, where he was to reside. She acted here as the Pope has just acted with respect to England. I say nothing of the Jerusalem bishopric, as an attempt was made to avoid the charge of schism in its creation. The English Bishop there does not claim to be Bishop of Jerusalem, but only to be "Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem;" and in the late primate's letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem, there is a disclaimer of interference with his jurisdiction, that of the new bishop being confined to European congregations, and to Jews converted through Europeans. This, then, is not so obvious an act of intrusion and aggression as the Canadian and Maltese appointments. I do not say that either of these was wrong—far from it; but I say that, having made them, the English Church has no right whatever to complain of the Pope's recent act being an aggression or intrusion. She has done the like herself whenever she had an opportunity.

The Pope, however, it is said (by few, indeed, and not in popular meetings), has by this act cut off all possibility of a renewal of communion between the English Church and his own. The possibility that certain doctrines defined at Trent might be reconsidered at a future council, at which Anglican bishops might assist, and that different conclusions in respect to them might be arrived at, and that in consequence of this "the sister churches" might be at one again—this possibility, which some good men have cherished in their minds, though with scarcely a hope of its being realised, is now, it is said, at an end. The English Church is now altogether disowned.

If this were true, it would, I believe, be of no importance whatever; as the supposed possibility cannot be said to exist. *Nulla vestigia retrorsum* is the known maxim of Rome. The decrees of Trent may be added to, but Rome will cease to exist before she disowns any of them. It, however, is not true; and the recent act of the Pope has in reality made no change in his position towards the Church of England, nor in the possibility, such as it is, of a renewal of communion with her. This will be obvious if we look to the case of Syria. When the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches commenced, the Pope appointed a patriarch of Antioch, and bishops of some of the other cities; and the hierarchy thus constituted exists to this day. Yet, notwithstanding its existence, when a portion of the Greek Church, and a portion of the Monophysite Church, which rejected the decision of the council of Chalcedon, became willing to admit the supremacy of Rome, they were received into communion with her, retaining their ancient hierarchy and their peculiar customs. There are accordingly, at this time, five distinct hierarchies in Syria—five patriarchs of Antioch, for instance, three of them in connexion with Rome! The majority of the population of Syria who are in the Roman obedience are Maronites; their clergy are at liberty to marry; they communicate in both kinds, and retain their ancient customs and liturgy, the latter being merely purged of what Rome considered to be heretical. Surely what has been done in one place may be done in another. If any persons flatter themselves that a return to the Roman obedience can ever become desirable, there is still the precedent of the Maronites for them to refer to. And this case of the Syrian Churches may teach others also that, whatever they may think, the Church of Rome does not regard the existence of two or more bishops in the same place as an impossibility. She has herself three existing bishops within the same territory; and she has never denied the Greek bishops to be such, although she pretends that they are schismatic; so that she recognises a fourth, though she does not communicate with him. Surely this proves that it is a very small matter about which such an ado has been made.

But for the insult to the Queen and the people of England, of which the Pope has been guilty, I cannot, for the life of me, see in what it consists. Allow me to illustrate his conduct by a parallel case. An Anabaptist preacher came into a certain parish, and exerted himself to preach his peculiar opinions among its inhabitants. The clergyman did what he could to put them on their guard against him; but the squire pooh-poohed the danger, and did what he

could to weaken the clergyman's hands. At length, one fine morning, he heard that his own daughter was baptised in an ornamental piece of water in his park. At this he flew into a tremendous passion; called the preacher all manner of names, and inveighed against the fellow's insolence in intruding into his park, and interfering with a member of his family—his ancient and honourable family. The man coolly said he had only done his duty. He had been acting according to his views of what was right; and the idea of insolent intrusion, that was uppermost in the squire's mind, had never entered his at all. His last step was an annoying one, and was deeply to be regretted by the head of the family; but no one could with justice blame him for that step. His sin consisted in his being an Anabaptist preacher at all. In like manner Dr. Ferretti may be, and I have no doubt is, committing sin in being Pope; but it is absurd to blame him for any particular act which he does in the exercise of that office, and to suppose that he intended to insult our Sovereign is ridiculous in the extreme. We must regret that he had so many in England who owned his authority, as to justify him, according to his own views of duty, in taking such a step; but, if such be unhappily the case, we have no grounds for blaming him, any further than we blame him for being Pope at all.

The episcopal titles, however, which he has conferred are worthless, if there be not a people who voluntarily submit to the authority which they profess to bestow. A titular bishop, an archbishop, or even cardinal, is nothing except to those who are pleased to become his subjects; unless, indeed, the number of these voluntary subjects should give him influence with the State, as being to a certain degree their representative. A prudent statesman cannot overlook those who become in any manner the representatives of large masses of the people, and who can guide them on any important subject. Hence the influence, the necessary influence, of the Pope's Irish archbishops and bishops. If the English titulars do not at once step into an equal degree of influence, it is not because there is any peculiar sanctity in the soil of England, but simply because they will not, in the first instance at least, represent such numbers of people. If we wish, then, to keep them down, we must endeavour to prevent them from increasing the number of their subjects; and how is this to be accomplished? I would rather answer by pointing out how the contrary is to be effected. Do you wish to make Cardinal Wiseman and his colleagues possessed of real influence in England? If so, you have just two steps to take. Persecute the new bishops themselves—disgust, and so drive out of the Church those churchmen who, if they secede, will be sure to join their communion. These are the two steps recommended in the after-dinner epistle of the Premier.

I have been too long accustomed to regard Lord John Russell with respect, and almost reverence, for me to be willing to say what I feel and think on the subject of this most unstatesmanlike production. By the epithet which I have applied to it, I would intimate the hope which I still cherish, that he will not cling pertinaciously to what he has advanced in it—that he will admit such an appeal as was made of old to such an autocrat as Philip.

I am, &c.,

AN IRISH BENEFICENT CLERGYMAN.

Nov. 16.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE QUEEN'S SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY, AND OTHER TOPICS.

To the cool, moral, and reflecting mind, contemplating the present position of England, what humiliating scenes must present themselves! There is that something in the English character for which it is difficult to account. Give the English a leader in accordance with their prejudices, and onward they rush, reckless of the consequences. Right and wrong, justice and reason, must equally yield to their impetuosity; and then only do they discover the injury inflicted upon their country, their neighbours, and themselves, when a return to self-possession places before them the direful effects of their ebullitions. How low in the scale of reason must their present conduct reduce them in the estimation of foreign nations! Has not England too much reason to blush for the undignified and inconsistent conduct of even her Prime Minister, and other leading authorities—the Minister of a dignified and gracious Sovereign, who, if not misguided by the interested bias of those around her, would evidently render equal justice to every class of her subjects? Well may Cardinal Wiseman ask if even the fountains of justice are not tainted! The determination expressed by foreign powers to require, before they venture to the Exhibition of 1851, a security that they shall not be insulted on account of their religion, supplies a sufficient index to their sentiments.

What is this "Papal aggression" which has excited such confusion and tumult, and seems to have frightened the nation out of its propriety? The Catholic bishops instead of continuing any longer vicars apostolic with foreign episcopal titles, have taken their titles from different cities or towns in the dioceses which they govern. The right to adopt this measure was conceded to them by the Emancipation Act, unless that act was intended as a mere "mockery, a delusion, and a snare." How, then, can justice complain? Yet this has given rise to so much that is contradictory in sentiment, and in argument absurd! "The Church in danger!" has been sounded from almost every pulpit in the Established Church. Are the established clergy aware of the concession contained in this cry? If their Church be the work of God it cannot be in danger; if the work of man in opposition to God, like its author it contains within it the elements of decomposition and cannot survive. The Catholic is never heard to express a fear that his Church is in

danger. Persecutors may rage, tyrants may oppress her; but these are the crucible in which all the virtue she possesses is proved, her origin attested. "The Catholics do not acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Queen." Neither does the Church of Scotland, or any of the varied denominations of other Dissenters. Yet, with these, not only the laity, but the clergy of the Established Church are making common cause. "The Church of England" says Earl Fitzwilliam at York, "is but one of the sects which have grown up since the Reformation, and in all of which I venture to say that vital Christianity is to be found. I claim this not alone for that portion of the Reformation to which I belong, I concede it to all the reformed sects." The Rev. Dr. Cumming in his lectures, says "he believed that all the sects of the Protestant Church differed only in ceremonial details, and that they agreed in all that was vital, permanent, and precious." To multiply quotations would be superfluous, as the same doctrine is echoed from pulpits to lectures, and from lectures to public meetings. The Established Church, through her organs, admits that all the Dissenters agree with her in all that is vital, permanent, and precious; but the Dissenters do not admit the spiritual supremacy of the Queen, therefore the spiritual supremacy of the Queen is not vital, permanent, or precious. Again, the Dissenters do not admit of bishops or episcopally ordained clergy; but the Dissenters agree in all that is vital, permanent, and precious; therefore bishops and episcopally ordained clergy are not vital, permanent, or precious. To Dissenters it appears a natural question, Why, then, should the nation be compelled, at the annual cost of nearly nine millions, to support such bishops and clergy? Is not this an overpowering argument in favour of the Anti-State-Church Society? There is no class of individuals more rootedly despised by the State clergy than the Dissenting ministers; but the State clergy now stand in need of their assistance, and they call for their aid. Let the Dissenters be upon their guard, the ball is *ostensibly* aimed at the Catholic; but, remove Catholicity, and the Dissenter receives the wound.

Let us pursue the question of spiritual supremacy a little further. It may be admitted by the Church of England in words, but in practice it is a chimera. The truth has forced itself upon one of even her Majesty's bishops. "He could not admit," says the Bishop of Exeter, "that her Majesty was the earthly head of the Church." What more than this is asserted even by the Catholic? And in the recent Gorham case, her Majesty displayed too much dignity and solid sense to attempt such an anomaly. To whom was the question respecting baptism referred—a question involving nothing short of the very existence of Christianity? Not to the Queen, nor yet to the Archbishop of Canterbury, for he acknowledged that he had no other means of arriving at a correct conclusion than the person who applied to him; but it was referred for solution to a lay tribunal! Supremacy and private judgment cannot subsist together. It pleased God to command all mankind to hear his Church. "*He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.*" It devolves upon Him, therefore, as a necessary consequence, to secure that Church from error. But, with a Church by *English law established*, and acknowledging itself fallible, spiritual supremacy is incompatible—it is a contradiction in terms; for if it be the duty of each one to judge for himself, by what right can another claim to control him? Still the head of a Church divinely appointed must necessarily, under God, be the fountain of true doctrine, and, in every disputed question, the tribunal of ultimate appeal. Let an appeal be made to her Majesty in any such theological question, and what must be her reply? No other than that so consistently given by the Archbishop of Canterbury: "I am only, like you, fallible, nor have I any source of information to which you are denied access." The position of our beloved Sovereign must be painful in the extreme; for whilst the meanest of her subjects—*excepting Catholics*—can select what appears to him the most secure way to heaven, to her is denied that most inestimable privilege! Though *supreme head* of a religion founded on the right of private judgment, she is not *permitted*—of course by some authority more supreme than her own—to exercise that judgment for herself! And she must adhere to Protestantism or forfeit her right to her Crown!

What is the real *crime* of the Catholics? It is admitted that they were once the rightful owners of much of the Church property in this kingdom, and it almost looks as if the present possessors of this property were on the alarm; and the Clergy of the Church of England, and other possessors of Church property, are daily haunted by the ghost of Catholicity. It meets them at every turn. In their moonlight rambles, pursued by this relentless spectre, the rippling of every stream, and the flickering of every leaf, causes a gelid horror to run through their every vein; it casts a gloom over all their enjoyments by day, and disturbs their slumbers by night! A panacea for every evil, however, seems to have been discovered; and that by a minister of the mild and unpersecuting Church of England—the specific of the Rev. Dr. McNeile, the elect of Liverpool, and of Exeter Hall. He should remember there is no shorter way to heaven than by martyrdom. His death-scheme—if I may be the judge—is not more likely to succeed than transportation; for it was said in the primitive ages "that the blood of martyrs was the seed of Christianity."—"How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the gospel of peace!"

G. C.

The SIXTEENTH SERIES will contain various important documents.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

THE "PAPAL AGGRESSION;"—WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

AND

THE "MINISTERS AND THE POPE."

THE "PAPAL AGGRESSION;"—WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

(From "Tait's Magazine" for January, 1851.)

Whose mind does not, at the first hint of the subject, fly back first, but not only, to the "Popish Plot" of the seventeenth century—that most hideous page of English history? Think for a moment of the idiotical origin, and yet the long continuance and ferocious cruelties, of *that* alarm. "The proceedings on the 'Popish Plot,'" says Charles James Fox, "must ever be considered as an indelible disgrace upon the English nation, in which the Parliament, judges, juries, witnesses, prosecutors, have all their respective though certainly not equal shares." Yes, *there*—in the disgrace being truly that of the nation—is what distinguishes that from other bloody spots in our history, where the rulers, often not only not identical with but antagonistic to the people, were the only real offenders. But that period, from 1678 to 1683, belongs emphatically to the people. And what a marvel and a lesson it is! A sensible people for five years stark mad; a courageous people for five years in abject terror; a generous and element people for five years imbruing their hands in innocent blood, to discover at the end that they had surrendered their senses, and their courage, and their humanity, at the bidding of half-a-dozen perjurers, of intellect as contemptible as their crimes were enormous; that the Parliament had proscribed, and the courts condemned, and the scaffold reeked, all for *nothing*—for a lie. What a lesson was here! and how soon and often it was forgot! Similar follies and crimes have been perpetrated over and over again, though not on the same scale as to extent and duration, and in forms modified according to the character of the age. The people were as generally deluded with as baseless a cheat when, in 1780, Lord George Gordon, with his body-guard of 50,000 men, and his cart-loads of petitions, as "numerously and respectfully signed" as those of the last two months, made London the scene of battle and conflagration for a whole week. Even in 1829, the people, measured by numbers and by popular manifestations, had not got the length of being willing to concede to their Roman Catholic countrymen the rights of citizenship: to forget that the measure of that year was a measure carried by statesmen *against* the prevailing feeling in England and Scotland, would be to ignore an indubitable fact, and forget a valuable lesson. The present Duke of Marlborough, who, in 1829, made a motion in favour of universal suffrage, as a means of defeating the Emancipation Act, took no very false view of the *set* of the popular current. And, since then, has not the most effective and damaging weapon against every Liberal ministry been, that they were "leagued with Popery," seeing that they received the votes of Irish members, and were "enemies to Protestantism," seeing that they had an eye to the reduction of the Irish Church? Now, remembering many things of which these are but specimens, is there not at least a very strong possibility that we may be foolish and mistaken *now* as on the same subject we have often been foolish and mistaken before? Rational on other points, have we not good reason to suspect ourselves in this? "*That way madness lies.*"

In one remarkable, and, as affects the present moment, most instructive point, does the present differ from former outbreaks of the same origin. Ever till now the *statesmen* of the day have repressed and discouraged, not participated and stimulated. In 1680, whatever of sanity was left in the nation was found among the men in office, who did the little they could to allay, and uttered not one word to excite. In 1780, the Ministers, like the King, were sufficiently anti-Popish; but they did not feed and dignify the alarm by writing "alarmed and indignant" letters to bishops, they met it with legislative and ministerial resistance; and, when they hesitated to use military power, save with the usual preliminaries and formalities, even the No-Popery George III. took that upon himself. And since that period down to this, 1850, which is now closing with this new blemish on its history, it is instructive to notice how uniformly the cries, such as the one we are deafened with now, came from "the people," the resistance from the statesmen. Not only did the most glorious among the great names of Whigdom earn their chief glories by their long, steady, stern resistance to all the bigotries and alarms in which this subject was fertile, but there is not, even among Tory statesmen, a single name not now a laughing-stock to which the same honour cannot be assigned. Even Pitt, who deserted so much, never deserted this; and Burke, after having swung backwards to intolerance in all things else, was occupied to his latest day in renewing his protest, and re-pointing his arguments, against the bigotries and fool-born alarms on the subject of "Popery." But *nous avons changé tout cela*; and should we see anything wonderful, anything too demonstrative for question, in the

result? In such matters former statesmen sought to make great commotions small, and partially failed; Lord John Russell seems to have sought to make a small one great, and his success has been tremendous. But then, compared with the task of the statesmen of former days, that was a very easy thing—as easy as the ignition, compared with the extinguishing, of a fire, where lay a powder-magazine, well ticketed as dangerous, though somewhat drenched by Lord John's predecessors; and his lordship, playfully tossing in a torch, has brought a very old house about his and our ears. In the facts we have been hurriedly and feebly seeking to recall and enforce, that the present is a subject regarding which we have ever been apt to go weakly and wildly astray, and that in a stimulant being now applied by those who had hitherto furnished only sedatives we have an explanation of a great deal of the commotion that has arisen, we have, we hope, succeeded in damaging the notion by which some people are possessed, that the magnitude and fierceness of the alarm are in themselves evidence of its justice and reasonableness. We have also, we would fain hope, shown cause why we ought not to be laughed or hissed down unheard, when we try to show—for nothing less audacious is our attempt—that we have been terrifying ourselves at a clumera, and getting “alarmed and indignant” in mistake.

At the same time, we shall not seek to avoid admitting and facing the fact, that this agitation has been joined by men ordinarily the least likely of all to be deceived by a chimera, or led with too much facility into a theological furor. For instance, we shall admit, though we may be laughed at for our exceeding candour, that nothing has seemed to us a more lamentable and formidable feature in the agitation than the adherence given to it by *Mr. Punch*. We do not mean the brutally stupid and brutally-spirited proposal with which his pages were once soiled, to make the recent proceedings of Dr. Wiseman treason and death (though the fact of such a proposal appearing in such pages is surely a striking and warning sign of the madness that is abroad), nor even to some as weak but less bloodthirsty documents since issued by his Humpiness, but to those that bear the impress, almost obliterated though it be by such uncongenial work, of the hand of the shrewd and manly Thackeray. “Of all men else I'd have avoided thee.” Not that we think that *Punch* might have been expected with absolute certainty to examine carefully and speak coolly at such a time and on such a subject, but because, being usually eminent as a discerner and hater of humbug, he might have been of immense value on our side, while in his desertion he became a tower of strength to the adverse faction, which they very much wanted, and could never have looked for. No wonder that fanaticism and humbug sprang rapidly into strength and acceptance, when the respective official enemies of each, the Premier and *Punch*, deserted their posts in one week. But how do you account for such desertions? By means which we are about to explain in detail, but the substance of which is, that the writer we have named, and others like him, coming to the question filled with a laudable repugnance to priestly pretensions, have, in their zeal and haste, allowed their feelings to master their judgment, and, among other confoundings of things that differ, have confounded the civil with the spiritual, claims with powers, and names with things.

But neither must we allow it to be forgot that we have something like a set-off against all this. We find that many, whom we might naturally expect to find elsewhere, are to be found in the ranks of this agitation; on the other hand, many whom we would have looked for there are to be found on the side of sense and soberness. To take an instance of a general character: in Scotland, where Popery is more deeply abhorred by the populace than in England, and where Papists are represented not by premier dukes and ancient gentry, but mainly by reckless or pauperised Irish immigrants, the matter has been taken with a coolness contrasting instructively with the fever in England. Of course, there have not been a-wanting many very willing to take advantage of such a capital opportunity to resume harping on the old strings, which have hardly given forth a sound since the No-Popery agitation against the Melbourne Ministry. But in Scotland only that class can be said to have spoken, and spoken with less power and acceptance than they used to speak with when the themes of their denunciation were the “Appropriation Clause” and the Irish National Schools. Even in the Church Courts of the Establishment, a minority of the clergy—a minority greater than supported any of those liberalising measures which the Legislature has adopted and the Churches have opposed during the last half century—have resisted the agitation as proceeding on an enormous mistake and conducted in an intolerant spirit. We lately observed in the Scotch papers (such documents don't seem to find their way to the London ones) a string of resolutions moved by the minister of the High Church of Edinburgh, and seconded by another of the city clergy, and Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University, from not one word of which do we dissent; and which state, with a remarkable clearness and closeness of logic, precisely and to the fullest extent the views we are here maintaining. The Scottish Voluntary Dissenters also, a body much more numerous and powerful in proportion to the population than their brethren in England, have almost to a man refused to join the agitation; and some of their chief men have even declared it inexpedient to make the theology of Popery, at this time, the subject of pulpit discussion, lest they should be held as countenancing “an absurd and unchristian agitation.” The Liberal newspapers of Scotland are also stated to be—with not above half-a-dozen exceptions, compensated for by recruits from the non-Liberal sections—strenuously opposed to the movement. Not a dozen meetings in support of the agitation have been held north of the Tweed, and of these not one was really “public.” Hurrah for canny Scotland! We might say canny Lancashire too, for there also the Liberal press is, in the main, sound; and in the list of attendants at the Liverpool and Manchester meetings, you will look in vain for the names of any of the well-known Liberals of these districts—the Phillippes, Gregs, Armitages, and Heywoods, of Manchester, and the Earles, Rathbones, and Aikins, of Liverpool. In short, as Scotland is cool compared with England, the English provinces are cool compared with the metropolis. The centre of the heat is London, and especially the London press. Why, the bulk even of the clergy—nay, the very bishops—are not so furious as some London journals that have all their lives before been treating “No-Popery” as a humbug and a disgrace. These things are worth something to us considered positively; but, viewed comparatively with the opposing manifestations, they go a very great length to establish the point we are, for the moment, mainly anxious to fix the reader's attention upon. When we find opinions *clashing* in this unprecedented manner, many on each side doing the reverse of what might be expected from their position and antecedents; when we find Scotland charitable where England is intolerant; when in the beating of the drum ecclesiastic we find clergy comparatively cool, and London newspapers absolutely furious; when in the same week we find *Punch* seriously clamouring for the gallows for Roman Catholic bishops, and the

Archbishop of Canterbury saying, "It is more necessary to keep the existing excitement within due bounds than to add to it"—is there not something like presumptive evidence in favour of our view, that there is to some extent, and on the one side or the other, mistakes in fact, and confusion of ideas?

With some further chance, we would fain hope, of getting a hearing, we now resuscitate the simple facts of the case, long since drowned amid floods of declamation and irrelevancy. The Church of Rome has two modes of conducting her ecclesiastical affairs: one that which existed in England till last October, the other that which exists in England now. The former system is adopted, apparently, in countries where Roman Catholics are few or (as in countries such as China) have not full toleration; the other in countries where Roman Catholics are in considerable numbers, and have the same liberties as all the other religious bodies, or (where there is an establishment) all the other dissenters. In acting under either of these systems, the Pope (who in such matters acts not of his own knowledge and desires, but under the guidance of the ruling portion of his Church in the country concerned) has also two ways of proceeding. In countries where the Romish religion is more or less acknowledged by the State—whether the general character of the country is Romish, as in France, or Protestant, as in Prussia—he makes his nomination and arrangements, to some extent, in co-operation with the Governments. In countries where the Romish religion is *not* acknowledged by the State—whether, as in our own country, from another and only one, or, as in the United States, from there being *no* religion adopted by the State—he proceeds, and *necessarily* proceeds, without consulting the Governments; in fact, our own Government is legally prohibited from holding any communication with the Court of Rome. Accordingly, the Pope, who had in England nominated and re-arranged as he chose, under the former of the two systems described, has now, on the advice, judicious or not, of his leading adherents here, changed to the second of the two systems, and made his nominations and re-arrangements accordingly. In other words, he has disused a system which, so far as we can find, is in use in *no* country where the circumstances at all resemble those of Great Britain, and has adopted that which, so far as we can find, is in use in *every* country similarly situated—the system which, to take familiar and unexceptionable instances, has been long in use in Ireland and the United States.

Now, in examining this procedure, and the objections that have been brought to it, let the reader and us be careful to keep our minds to the real matter in hand. The question is not whether the Roman Catholic religion is not an unsound one theologically, and a bad one in its social and political influences, nor whether it is not quite possible that *some* of her ecclesiastical acts may have a political motive and effect. We have no intention to shirk any one of these points, and shall take them up in due course; but, in the first place, the question is not one ranging over the Roman Catholic doctrines and ecclesiastical system, but merely, What is the substance and what are the effects of *the thing that has been done now?*

The thing that has been done is simply this: the English Roman Catholics used to be ecclesiastically governed first by four, then by eight persons called bishops, but taking their episcopal titles from places in Barbary, and styling themselves "vicars-apostolic" of southern or northern districts in England, for the purposes of which arrangement England was divided into four, and then into eight districts; the English Roman Catholics are now governed by twelve persons calling themselves bishops, and taking their titles from the districts where they actually reside, for the purposes of which arrangement England has been divided into twelve districts. The difference between a vicar-apostolic and a bishop is simply this: that the former acts merely as the vicar of the Pope, and according to directions proceeding immediately from Rome, while the latter, and his clergy with him, form a Church, still acknowledging, indeed, the Pope as their spiritual head, but managing their own ecclesiastical affairs among themselves, and *not*, as formerly, through the Pope. The first objection to the new arrangement is, that it is an evasion of the law. "The Roman Catholics," says the *Times*, "have not violated the law, but they have evaded it. And what is that law? It is the Emancipation Act of 1829, won for them against unparalleled difficulties by the generous exertions of the members of that very Church which they are cajoling, betraying, and invading—in a breath, it is the charter of their political liberties and spiritual freedom which they now seek to elude and undermine by all the arts of sophistry and chicanery." This is a fair specimen of the blunders made, and of the tone in which they are put forth; as if the Roman Catholics were taking ungenerous advantage of some omission or defect in the Emancipation Act. This is the slickest nonsense. The Emancipation Act was not "the charter of their spiritual freedom;" they had long before, without any limitation expressed or understood, acquired the same rights with other dissenters as to forms of worship and moles of Church government. The only clause in the Emancipation Act having any bearing on the present matter is one (24th) quite irrelevant to the objects of that Act, which was introduced in the Lords avowedly (such was the Duke of Wellington's explanation) to please the bishops with a meaningless trifle, and which the Roman Catholics have, in this case, demonstrably, *neither* broken nor "evaded." That clause merely prohibited the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church from distinguishing themselves by the names of places already in use by the prelates of the Established Church; and that it was not thereby meant to prohibit them using the names of *other* places is plain, not only from the clause not simply prohibiting them doing so, which would have been incomparably more natural and simple, but from the fact that the operation of the clauses is restricted to England and Ireland, Scotland being excluded, for the obvious and only possible reason that there the name of no place is legally in possession of any prelate—consequently, in Scotland, any place was left open, while, in England, the places in use by established prelates, and such places *only*, were prohibited. But this clause not only does this—it shows plainly that the framers of the Act contemplated the probability or certainty of the Roman Catholic Church in England leaving, as it now has, the undeveloped for the developed form; as they already saw it not only in the foreign countries around, and in the United States, but in Ireland, a portion of the United Kingdom. We confidently ask any man of common sense (by-the-by, it was strange that even Cardinal Wiseman should miss this point), would any men have prohibited the Roman Catholics from taking the names of certain places as titles if they had intended that there should not be any such bishops at all? The second objection on the point we are here dealing with is, that the "territorial divisions" are somehow or another "unconstitutional," or something of that sort, variously and vaguely expressed. This objection has the fortune of being popular—the great card of the shallow, the unthinking, and dishonest portion of the agitators—and of being expressly repudiated by the ablest and honestest. Thus, the chief speaker at "the great Edinburgh meeting," the principal of the Free Church College, confessed he "could find no civil element in it;" and the

Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Hinds) in his excellent, but too tardy reply to his clergy, declares that the Roman Catholic or any episcopally-governed Church "is not tolerated" if it has not power to make these "territorial divisions." Indeed, the thing is as plain as day; you cannot have twelve bishops all with equal power everywhere; and, moreover, what difference in principle is there between the twelve territorial divisions existing now and the eight divisions existing till last October, or the four divisions existing till a few years ago? And some kind of territorial divisions being necessary, what kind were they to take? Were they to take the territorial divisions of the Establishment? Even if that would not have looked more like "aggression" than the other course, how could they have managed it, when they only needed twelve bishops and the Establishment has twenty-four dioceses? But some (including the *Examiner*!) cry, in the opposite key, "They have made too many—they have made as many as if the whole population belonged to their Church." As to making too many, that, we suggest, may, with most propriety and perfect safety, be left to those who are to pay them, and whom they are to govern; we who are neither to pay nor be governed need not be very critical on that point. As to having made the number as if the population were wholly or generally Roman Catholic, that, besides coming under the reply just given, is palpably untrue and non-sensical. If it had been true, they would have taken the same number as the Establishment—twenty-eight, not twelve; but, on the contrary, they have only twelve bishops for England, with a population of 16,000,000, while they have twenty-six for Ireland, with a population of 8,000,000—more than double the number of bishops for half the population: proof positive (though we cannot see that the thing is really worth proving) that they have proceeded on this point not as affecting to "possess the land," but respective solely of their own dimensions and distribution as a Church.

A more important point, though fortunately capable of being more briefly disposed of, is, What is the practical effect of the thing done? On the English Roman Catholics themselves, the effect is to render them *more independent of the Court of Rome*. Yes, we repeat—and amid all that has been said, we have never seen this disproved nor even denied—that the effect of the change which has created so much "alarm and indignation" is greatly to *deprive* the Pope of influence and the functions he has hitherto exercised in this country, without any one feeling called on to become alarmed or indignant. To illustrate the change by a Protestant parallel, the former position of the Roman Catholic Church in England was similar to that of an English Protestant *mission* (say in the colonies), where the missionaries act under the orders of the society or Church that sent them out; its present position is similar to that of such a mission when it has assumed the organisation of a *Church*, and when its missionaries have become *ministers*, by being formed into a presbytery or passing under the rule of a local bishop. The effect in the one case is to make the mission more colonial and less mother-country; in the other to make the English Roman Catholics, in their ecclesiastical connexion, less Romish and more English. That is all the effect of the change on the English Roman Catholics. And what is its effect on *non-Catholics*, or the community at large? *Nothing*; literally, absolutely, demonstrably *nothing*. Not one man within the four seas is affected by it to the extent of one farthing of his purse or one feather of his dignity. These bishops acquire no new power, nor have *any* power "to tithe or toll in our dominions;" no man, unless he is so minded, need call them archbishop or bishop, any more than he need apply the same title to the bishops of the episcopal dissenters of Scotland, or call the Presbyterian Dr. Cumming, "Moderator," or the Wesleyan Dr. Hannah, "President;" and the bishops of *other Churches*—the bishops of the Church chosen by the State—are left unmolested in the possession of everything, civil, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, that is theirs: their powers, their palaces, their peerages, and their magnificent revenues. The change, we say, is one which, besides affecting Roman Catholics only, as rendering them more independent of Rome, does not affect nor concern other people at all. In truth, other people would never have heard about it, if it had not been that, just at the time of the appointments, the London newspapers were (on good grounds) ill-disposed towards the Pope and Popery, and had nothing else to occupy them; whereupon Satan (who, having an interest in the promotion of strife and evil-speaking, has not made a better hit for many a day) found some mischief for their idle hands to do.

So much for the thing that has been done; the next objection is to the *by whom* it has been done. The cry is, that it has been done by the Pope, "a foreign prince." Virtually, it has *not* been done by the Pope, who probably never knew, till he signed the rescript, of any such names as Haggletown, Clifton, Newport, and others, by which that document distinguished the English Roman Catholics bishops; the arrangement was, must have been, the work really of the leaders and rulers of the English Roman Catholics themselves. Nominally, indeed, it is the Pope's doing; but *do* look at the fact that, according to the constitution of the Romish Church as everywhere existing, and as known to exist before we granted the Roman Catholics religious freedom, Romish prelates must either be nominated through that channel or not at all; that, to say that the Pope shall not nominate Roman Catholic prelates is to say that the Roman Catholic Church shall not exist, cannot be tolerated; and look also at the fact that the Pope always nominated those vicars-apostolic whom nobody objected to, and who differ from the present bishops only in being less under the Pope's control. Further, though the Pope is "a foreign prince," it is mere trickery and trash to speak of him as such in connexion with this matter. He acts as spiritual head of the Romish Church, not as Sovereign of the Roman States; and his powers in the former capacity would be as great although in the latter Mazzini were reigning in his stead. Nor does his being a petty Italian Sovereign confer one tittle of civil authority on his ecclesiastical nominees, any more than the possibility of the British Mormons acknowledging as their spiritual head some person who happened to be Governor of one of the United States would render the ecclesiastical doings of that potentate "dangerous" and "aggressive." The only point in which the civil sovereignty of the Pope appears is in making Dr. Wiseman a *Cardinal*, which is a civil dignity in the Roman State; but that is a point not in the least affecting the general question, and which there would be nothing intolerant in prohibiting, although we do not well see how that is either practicable or worth while, seeing that many Englishmen (the Duke of Wellington, for instance) who have held high civil offices under the English Crown were at the same time peers and privy councillors of foreign and often inimical countries.

But there is the *manner*, the *language* of the thing. It is so arrogant and "assumptive." It is so, and as such we abominate it. But the language of the Romish Church ever was, and we fear ever will be, in that strain; and the question whether that fault should be regarded as a political offence, or met otherwise

than by whatever language other Churches choose to reply with, was one of the very things considered, and, as we had hoped, *settled*, in the repeal of the test and penal laws. Moreover, if ecclesiastical insolence is to be matter of political or civil condemnation, alas! who among us shall stand? If every time that a Church resorts to "insolent" language Prime Ministers are to write letters, and the nation, not only through its ecclesiastical, but through its political and municipal organisations, is to throw itself into agonies of rage and fear, it would be infinitely better to go back at once to the old system, under which the use of insolence was restricted by law on one side.

And here, having glanced at the objections applying specifically to the *three* points—the *what*, the *by whom*, and the *how*, we slide into some less important, having a more general reference. The first of these is one in close connexion with the special point we have last touched upon. It is said that the Pope, speaking through his "apostolic letter," has asserted a *claim of spiritual dominion* over England. This phrase, in the various and absurd meanings that have been put upon it, lies at the root of much of the fear and the fury that have arisen. We treat special attention to the *two* grand misconceptions, or confusions of ideas, prevailing on this point. The first is the confounding of a *claim with a power*. The Pope's *saying* (and, by-the-bye, he only said it in as far as he does not specially acknowledge the other Churches in the country) that he is the spiritual superior of England and of all the world, is a very small thing practically, though it may be a great thing ludicrously; while his being able to *do* anything whatever in enforcement of his claim would be an enormous and intolerable thing. But he has no possible mode of having his claim acknowledged by any Englishman whose voluntary belief does not lead him to do so; and his Holiness's apostolic letter, with all its formalities and pomposities and assumptions, is mere waste-paper as regards every man in Britain who does not choose in his own person to believe in and agree with it. *This* is what people are perpetually forgetting; that anything that is not *law* as expressed in British statutes, or expounded by British Courts, is in Britain but a powerless, useless bit of paper. With this fact in view, all those references to the evil-doings of the Romish priesthood in other countries, all those evil-doings, we mean, arising from anything but mere *spiritual influence*, are seen to be nothing whatever to the purpose. Thus, *Punch* (Dec. 14) is very contemptuous of those who say that the authority of the Popish Bishops of England is merely spiritual, after what we have seen their brethren doing in Sardinia! Good *Mr. Punch*, before you set your hump in wrath and contempt, do be more careful that you know what you are speaking about—do look at the fact, that between the two cases you thus parallel there is not the slightest similarity. It was by no bull, or apostolic letter, or any other bit of paper, that the Pope and priests acquired that power in Sardinia which you and we now rejoice that the Piedmontese have wrested from them. They got it by *treaty* and by *statute*—by a treaty signed by the King of Sardinia, and a statute enacted by his Legislature. *Without* that the Pope's bulls would have been as powerless in Sardinia as they are in Britain; *with* that, they would have been as powerful in Britain as they were, till the other day, in Sardinia. The Piedmontese have thrown off the chain, and we applaud and rejoice; show us even a proposal to lay one link of it on Britain, and we shall not be slow nor nice in our resistance. *Then* would be the time for *Punch* and his friends to let fly with that ammunition which they are at present firing away furiously into empty air.

The other grand misconception prevailing on the point is, that, often confounding claims with power, people confound civil or political with spiritual or ecclesiastical—a mistake all-important as regards the present question; for claims of a character which, in politics, it would be sedition to avow and aarely to permit, can be uttered in ecclesiastical matters not only without legal or moral offence, but as a necessary consequence and accompaniment of the existence of religious liberty. A country has political liberty when all her citizens are equally ruled under *one* free constitution, against which no man can be allowed to speak, beyond certain limits, without incurring the penalty of sedition; but a country has religious liberty, not when her citizens live under *one* Church, however sound and liberal, but when every man chooses a Church for himself, and is at liberty, by all argument of mere speech, to maintain its claims, however absurd and arrogant. The distinction between the two things is broad and deep; but amid the dust and noise of the present outbreak they are daily confounded. For instances, too easily found, take these obtained from various articles in the *Times*, and fair specimens of the strain of argument and illustration generally adopted:—

"Pope Pius did not really depose Queen Elizabeth, nor did Pope Clement make a King Henry IX., or Louis XIV., a King James III.; but these acts gave rightful occasion of scandal to the people of England, and brought rightful chastisement on the chief offender. . . . Mr. Roebuck, and others with him, are fair to insist on the absence of any 'real danger.' It might have been urged with equal propriety that there was no 'real danger' on the 10th of April, seeing that to 15,000 malcontents or visionaries London could oppose 250,000 good citizens. But we know full well, from neighbouring examples, that if these 250,000 men had pooh-poohed the danger, the 15,000 would pretty soon have brought it to pass. . . . To use an illustration which current events make familiar, the pretensions of the Pope in England are exactly analogous to those of the Count de Chambord in France. Both rely on what they declare to be a divine, eternal, and infeasible right to dominion—a right which may be suspended by night, and contested by reason, but which can never be actually abrogated by any resolutions of Parliaments or people to the world's end. We will imagine that the Count de Chambord, after being for some time proscribed, was permitted to return to France—a measure actually now under discussion—and confirmed in the enjoyment of full, free, and equal rights of citizenship along with all other Frenchmen. Suppose the said personage, being received as a citizen, but not recognised as a Sovereign, should seize an opportunity to call and proclaim himself King; to ignore and set at nought contemptuously the institutions which, for pure toleration's sake, protected him; to create ministers and generals although ministers and generals already existed, and to impugn directly the legitimacy of the powers established, whether Monarchical or Republican, by establishing rival powers of the same denominations and functions at their very sides."

All this is quite sound and conclusive, *if* we grant the one postulate, that things political and things spiritual or ecclesiastical come, as to freedom of discussion, claim, and action, under the same category, and ought to be, or can be, treated alike. If we do *not* grant this, the whole comes to the ground as the merest tattle and trash. If the reader does not perceive the distinction from what has been said above, will scarcely fail to see it by looking coolly at the illustrations resorted to by the *Times*. Does it con-

sist with anyman's reason to believe that to deny the soundness, or the catholicity, or the anything else of a Church, is the same species of thing as to deny the right of a reigning monarch to his or her throne? Is a document declaring (with actual potency or impotency does not matter) that a king is deposed the same species of thing as a document declaring that a Church teaches error?—or is a document declaring that a certain Church is the only true Church the same species of thing as a document putting forward a new pretender to the Crown? Every man's every-day experience teaches him that the two things have nothing whatever in common; for he sees the one thing everywhere prohibited, and the other everywhere practised. If any man puts forth proclamations that Queen Victoria has no right to the throne, we punish him for treason, if any man discusses lesser matters of politics with a freedom fairly beyond certain limits, then we punish him for sedition; but if any man proclaims that his is the only true Church, and that all the rest of us are schismatics or heretics, we never heard till now that he needed or deserved any other answer than argument or merriment, as might seem best suited to his case. We cannot allow any man to deny that Victoria is our true Sovereign; we can and do allow any man to assert that this or that is not the true Church. We all in England live under the same civil constitution, but not under the same ecclesiastical. We are *one State*, but we are a *hundred Churches*. To admit in matters ecclesiastical such things as the *Times* chooses for its illustrations would be anarchy; to forbid them in matters ecclesiastical would be tyranny. We must add, that to confound the two so different things together, as millions are now doing, is *tyranny in the making*.

Another cry of the agitators, as fallacious, though not so extensively dangerous, as those which we have just considered, is, that what has been done is "an invasion of the Queen's prerogative." The Queen's prerogative, we had always simply imagined, was to appoint archbishops and bishops of the *Established Church*. Is it now meant that she has the prerogative of appointing the prelates of other Churches too? No. If the *Times* and its multitudinous followers are to be taken as exponents, it means that *there shall be no other bishops in England*. Now, look where this leads. Quoth the *Times*, "England has bishops and dioceses of her own, and no others can be appointed without insult to the Crown and kingdom, and just liabilities on the part of the offenders." We have here a hint of the circumstance which renders it a possibility to foist such fallacies on the public, as well as the consequences to which they point. To change the names, *Scotland had synods and presbyteries of its own*—those of the Established Church as appointed by legislative authority; yet the Scottish dissenters happening to be Presbyterians, have over and over again made new synods and presbyteries without ever thinking that they had "insulted the Crown and kingdom," and come under "just liabilities." It has so happened, however, that none of the dissenters from the Church of England are Episcopalians—otherwise there would have been "other bishops and dioceses" long ago, and the fallacy in present use would never have been born, or, at least, could never have lived. But will there never be any dissenters in England, save the Roman Catholics, requiring bishops for their Church government? Is there not an exceeding likelihood that, ere long, we shall see some coming out of the English Church carrying their *episcopal* principles with them? Lately, it seemed as if this exodus were to be composed of the Evangelical party—and, if we are not mistaken, a sort of beginning or nucleus already existed in the person of Mr. Shore, of Exeter; and now it is more likely to be the Puseyites, beginning with Mr. Bennett. But nobody knows whose may be the first turn, or whose the next; but any man may know who chooses to consider, that if this doctrine of no bishops nor dioceses save those of the Established Church being permissible is to be held good, episcopal dissenters are things prohibited.

Some further indication of the source and tendency of this monstrous doctrine, as well as some most instructive hints on other points of the question, may be found by casting a glance at the United States. It is probable that not one in a hundred of our readers ever knew, and that not one in a thousand of them now remembers, that, at the same time, and in the same phrases, the Pope did the same thing for the United States that he did for us. We make this broad numerical distinction between those who may once have known the fact and those who may now remember it, because the London press and other agitators were careful to announce it as "another evidence of papal insult and aggression;" and have been doubly careful *not* to say a word as to how that "insult and aggression" have acted on Jonathan, as compared with ourselves. We shall do what we can to spoil *that* game. Jonathan paid no attention whatever to the matter, till he saw what a condition we had put ourselves into; he then examined the source of dread, and is now utterly indifferent about himself and immensely amused about us. We cite brief but sufficient specimens from the two papers of greatest circulation and influence in the States:—"The journalists of England," says the *New York Herald*, "are deeply engaged in discussions and prophecies on the influences of the presence of a cardinal in that country. . . . We could have a cardinal here in every State, and no one would be distressed on account of it. We have already taken five archbishops with alacrity—Bishop Hughes, our esteemed friend, monitor, sage, brother, equal, and fellow-citizen, at their head; and we can digest a cardinal, or the Pope himself, with all the pleasure in life."

The *New York Courier and Inquirer* goes equally straight to the point:—"John Hughes is made Roman Catholic Archbishop in America, and the fact nowhere produces the slightest sensation. Nicholas Wiseman is made Roman Catholic Archbishop in England, and the whole island heaves with indignation and alarm. The one act scarcely elicits a passing paragraph in the American newspapers; the other surcharges the English press with a direful cholera, which finds vent in every style of wrathful rhetoric. As American Protestants, we must say that we cannot see the least reason in all this English clamour against papal encroachments and papal usurpations. The Pope has only placed the Roman Catholic Church in England on the same basis it has long possessed without opposition in Prussia, in the United States, and in other Protestant lands. The dignities he has created, and the functions he has conferred, are of a purely spiritual character. He has not interfered to the slightest extent with the temporalities of the Anglican Church. He has levied no tithes, has laid claim to none of his consecrated revenues, has not made the slightest attempt to appoint bishops to his ancient sees, now usurped, as he believes, by heretics. He has not sought to make his bishops and priests pensioners upon the public bounty, nor has he charged them with any duties in any way infringing upon the common law of the realm. The agitation occasioned by the late papal rescript in England, we believe, is mainly due to two causes—priestly jealousy and popular bigotry. The Anglican dignitaries are very naturally disturbed at this sudden elevation of a body of men to the same

nominal rank they have so long exclusively enjoyed, and it is not strange at all to hear their clamouring for penal enactments against the new hierarchy. The popular clamour of 'No Popery' springs from the same intolerant spirit that sustained the penal laws against dissenters for a hundred years, and against Roman Catholics for a hundred and fifty, and which even to this day bars a Jew out of the halls of legislation because of his religion. The moral grandeur of Protestantism consists in its respect for the human conscience, its reliance upon the word of God alone, and its calm disdain of all outward constraints, and all legal appliances, either against it or in its favour. Where, as in this country, these qualities are most manifested, there Protestantism is the strongest and most invulnerable. English Protestantism must be a craven thing to turn pale at the view of a primate's hat and a dozen prelatial mitres. It must be a weak thing to shake at the sight of his Holiness tracing a few beggarly lines on its map, and assigning one name to this division and another to that. It must be a foolish thing to suppose that it can, at this late day, check the power and the influence of its adversary by persecution or intolerance."

Surely the contrast here exemplified is striking enough to have deserved a corner in the expansive columns of the London newspapers. Perhaps they did not choose to reveal a fact which they felt it difficult or inconvenient to account for. The reader will not seek far before he finds the roots of the difference. In England, we have an Established Church; in the United States they have not. In England, happening hitherto to have had no bishops but such as had State rank, powers, and endowments, our idea of a bishop includes all these things; in the United States, having hitherto had no bishops but such as are bishops *only*, their idea of a bishop is that of a person exercising only spiritual rule, and that over those only who choose him and pay him. Of course, the confusion of ideas which leads people in this country to imagine that Roman Catholic bishops are somehow to resemble the bishop of the State Church is one which the supporters of that institution are not slow to encourage, and render worse confounded. In reality, the appointment of the Roman Catholic bishops neither injures nor insults the Established Church; but, if we had no Established Church, the present uproar would have been impossible and unthought of. There is one point of view in which Dr. Wiseman's recent sayings and doings might possibly have been regarded as just cause for a commotion, though not the *sort* of commotion we have had. They might have been taken as a symptom of the growth or the unchanged spirit of Popery, and so have been a call to Protestants to speak out, much as Mr. Thackeray speaks out in his "Appeal to an Eminent Appeler:"—"I deny your pretences utterly, and with my whole heart; I scorn your claim to infallibility. I no more care for your Pontifex Maximus than for the High Priest of Jupiter who preceded him; and, in my quality of Protestant, protest against you and every bishop, priest, and deacon under your orders; declaring my belief that honest people can get to heaven without you, and in spite of you, and entirely repudiating your clerical scheme. . . . Nicholas, who comes into Fleet-street, [and says, 'I am the ambassador and plenipotentiary of the infallible expositor of truth—I have the keys of heaven and the other place: come home with me, my boy, and I will show you a beautiful winking virgin, that will convert you in the twinkling of an eye—or a holy coat—or the bones of the eleven thousand virgins of Cologne—or what you will?—to such a Nicholas I say 'Bosh!' and snap my fingers." Good—very good! But have we not been "protesting too much," as if protesting under some great need or strong suspicion, and, above all, have we not been protesting in a wrong way and a wrong spirit? All we say is, that our protesting has been utterly inappropriate and monstrously disproportionate. If the thing was worth heeding at all, it was a thing for men as Protestants, and not as politicians; for ministers of religion, not Ministers of State. If the thing was bad, it bore with it no civil or secular sanction. Why, then, seek to meet it with civil or secular weapons? Why run to the *Queen*, to tell her that somebody is "making faces" at us at Rome?—for, at the most, it is but a matter of face-making. Next, even though the character of the agitation had been fitting and appropriate, how monstrously, how ridiculously does it exceed the importance of the circumstances! This is the view of the matter which is most humiliating to our pride. Even the *Times*, in its lucid intervals, sees and feels this. "We confess," it says, "to an indignant shame at the idea that an Italian priest should have succeeded in putting England on the defensive, and that gatherings and protests of Englishmen should actually have been provoked by the feeble nominee of certain foreign States on his insecure and tottering throne. We are ashamed that the energies of a great nation should have been expended on so unworthy an object." And well you may be ashamed who, when the fit was on, led and stimulated the humiliating folly. Look at what the "aggressive" party is, and what it has done, and what the "alarmed and indignant" party are, and have been doing!

"See ocean into tempest lashed,
To waft a feather, and to drown a fly!"

Look at Dr. Wiseman, with the Pope's powerless bit of paper, spreading terror and fury—among whom? Among a people where Popery is represented (generally speaking) by a poor, and ignorant, and insignificant minority; and where Protestantism is represented by forty-nine-fiftieths of the rank, and power, and wealth, and knowledge—is embodied in our institutions, inwoven with our very idioms of language, and endowed as no other religion in any country on earth is endowed! Yet, with all this, we could not, we are told, answer the Papists *in kind*, if we thought them worth answer at all: pulpit against pulpit, though we have a hundred to their one; bit of paper against bit of paper, though these, too, we have, or could have, a hundred to one—no, we must all, in all our capacities, political, municipal, even professional, (what a display was that of the College of Surgeons!) throw ourselves into convulsions, which have excited the amazement of the world as they will the laughter of posterity.

And, since we are in a plain-speaking mood, we shall say that the *spirit* and *language* in which this misdirected and exaggerated agitation has been carried on have been discreditably and injurious to our character as Englishmen, whose motto is fair play, and as Protestants, whose doctrine is toleration. Protestants have got so thoroughly possessed with the idea that they are very liberal and tolerant, that they are never restrained by any fear of transgressing in the other direction; and so thoroughly imbued with the conviction that the Papists are always intolerant, that facts to the contrary receive neither belief nor attention. Brethren, let us not be self-deceivers. All the liberality is *not* on one side, nor all the illiberality on the other. For one moment look and listen. Protestants often cry, "No-Popery!" Do we ever hear our Popish fellow-countrymen crying, "No Protestantism?" The whole political or ordinary press of England has ever

morning for months been coming out with the strongest and most sneering abuse of the Roman Catholic religion; what would be thought if the press of Ireland came out every morning in the same style on the Protestant religion? The mobs of English towns have been amusing themselves with burning effigies of the Pope and Archbishop Wiseman; what would be thought of the mobs of Irish towns amusing themselves by burning the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other personage whom Protestants regard with even one hundredth part of the reverence with which the Papists regard *their* spiritual head? What do you think of the fact that these things *are* done by Protestants, and are *not* done by Papists? To glance at another class of facts—Irish constituencies, nineteen in twenty Roman Catholics, return Protestants to Parliament without a word about their religion if their politics accord; we scarcely know a single popular constituency in Britain where a Roman Catholic, though in all other respects qualified and acceptable, would have the ghost of a chance! Four or five years ago, on a vacancy occurring in the representation of perhaps the most Liberal county constituency in Scotland, Kirkcubright, a Roman Catholic gentleman (Mr. Coustable Maxwell) of large possessions, high character, and great personal popularity, started as the Whig candidate, but found he might as well have started for the "Primateship of All England." Now, good Protestant reader, if the counterpart of this had happened even in the most thoroughly Popish county of Ireland; if a candidate otherwise welcome had been repudiated because he was a Protestant, would we not all have shouted, "What vile bigots those Papists are!" And if Mr. Maxwell had slipped in for Kirkcubright, would we not all have shouted, "How liberal we Protestants are!" But then, look how things *have* happened. The Protestant Mr. Herbert (we take the first instance that occurs to our mind) is made member for Popish Kerry, without a word about his religion; and Mr. Maxwell, solely on account of his religion, will never be member for Kirkcubright! What should we cry at *this*? Ah: "The case being altered, that alters the case." One instance more. At the very time (a few weeks ago) when we were all crying out about Popish bigotry, and heaping on the Roman Catholic religion every epithet of opprobrium and abhorrence, the Town Council of Dublin, five-sixths Roman Catholic, were unanimously electing a Protestant Lord Mayor. Are we likely soon to see a Roman Catholic Lord Provost of Edinburgh or Glasgow? And, finally (though we finish only for want of sufficient space), if a Popish Prime Minister wrote an official letter denouncing Protestantism as "slavery," "degradation," "superstition," and "mummery," he would scarcely succeed in keeping his head on his shoulders. Yet, when a Protestant Prime Minister so denounces Popery, he gets "three cheers" at a thousand meetings; and never did the Guildhall of London hear such thumping of tables and jingling of glasses! These are facts; look at them, think of them, and think especially if, in the face of them, we ought to regard ourselves as superabundantly stocked with that Christian virtue which speaketh no evil, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.

It will be a gross mistake and injustice if any reader should think, from anything that is said or that is omitted in the above observations, that we are either favourable to, or forgetful of, the nature of Popery as a religion, especially as regards its *influences* on matters social and political. We have not spoken directly and fully on that portion of the subject, only because we fear the reader's impatience; because, too, it is in part, beyond our province, and, not least, because that question is not really *raised* by the matter in hand. Dr. Wiseman's documents are no *new* manifestation of the nature of Popery, and (so, we hope, we have shown) his appointments confer upon it no *new* power. Still more—and here again we approach the root of all the mischief done out-of-doors, and rumoured as likely to be done in the Cabinet and Legislature—you ought not, and you *cannot*, *legislate against influences*. We ought not—it is persecution: if we as Liberals think Romanism has a despotic tendency, Tories think Protestant dissent has a democratic tendency; and if legislation, or attempts at it, had a beginning, where would be the end? We *cannot*—all history shows, in letters of blood, that these things are too subtle for laws and penalties: in the present case, to forbid the *names* would be paltry—to forbid the thing would be persecution; but both are practically *impossible*. The check and cure for bad influences is the application of good ones. We say, with Milton, "Let Truth and Falsehood grapple," and perish all force and "protection" as puerilities and poltrooneries.

THE "MINISTERS AND THE POPE."

(From the "Quarterly Review," No. 175.)

We readily admit, and Dr. Wiseman is welcome to the benefit of the admission, that the astonishment with which the Pope's bull for the erection of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England has been received at the close of 1850 is altogether unreasonable. The Bull of Pius IX. was drawn up, and Dr. Wiseman says printed, in 1847. The various causes that deferred its publication are of no consequence to us. Its existence was perfectly well known at that date in this country; we ourselves in vain endeavoured to fix on it the languid attention of the public; nor certainly have intervening occurrences tended to disturb our conviction then expressed, that this supreme insolence would be considered by the future historian as the natural fruit of the original rashness wherewith the Relief Bill of 1829 was framed, and of the persevering malice of Whig Governments against the Church of England. "Where do ye come from?" is but an unsatisfactory answer to the inquiries of the belated traveller; but it suggests the most important subject for reflection to the politician who is desirous of ascertaining his actual position and the means of extrication.

Her Majesty's Ministers are mainly and directly responsible for the aggression of which they now affect to be the first to complain. Were they so ignorant of the spirit of Popery, and so little acquainted with the character of the existing Pope, as to expect improvement from the one, or forbearance from the other? In every case the Roman court had displayed before the eyes of the whole world the same spirit of intolerance, arrogance, and pre-potency—in Prussia, in Switzerland, and in Ireland; and Pius IX., in one respect at least the worthy successor of Gregory VII., had shown far more energy in advancing his spiritual

dominion than in regulating his temporal sovereignty. While a prisoner in the Quirinal, or an exile at Gaeta, he did not abate one jot of his ecclesiastical pretensions; and when now, though barely maintained on his tottering throne by the bayonets of semi-infidel France, he presumes to violate more audaciously than ever the majesty of the British Sovereign, and throw a firebrand among the English people themselves, who has a right to be surprised?

When the scheme of Romish "Emancipation" first engaged the minds of statesmen, many circumstances concurred to mislead public opinion as to the nature of the problem to be solved, in order to bring about so great a change with safety. During the latter part of the last age the very spirit of Popery had seemed altered: the enlightened Ganganelli, the enemy of the Jesuits—the magnificent Braschi, the collector of statues and drainer of marshes—seemed rather called to vindicate their orthodoxy than to purge themselves from the charge of bigotry. At the close of the century the aspect of Europe was such, that there seemed everything to dread from infidelity—from superstition nothing. Neither Mr. Pitt, nor afterwards Lord Grenville, could much fear aggression from a Pontiff struggling in the iron grasp of France, and looking, as the only chance of deliverance, to the success of England and her allies; he was at that time in so low a condition that it might be doubted whether even in Ireland a new bull on a new subject would command much attention; yet neither of these thoughtful statesmen ever dreamt of *emancipation absolutely without safeguards*. On the restoration of the papal throne at the end of the war, it was generally assumed that a very moderate spirit prevailed, and would continue to prevail, in the grateful Vatican. The Pope permitted the English tourists, whose numbers and wealth made them of importance to the impoverished Romans, to assemble for worship in a barn without the walls. This concession, strenuously opposed by the priests of British birth (or blood) resident at Rome, was for that very reason regarded with additional confidence by others as the earnest of all future liberality; and it was only close observers who soon perceived how much the ancient *animus* of the Papacy was reviving, and how well-directed and systematic were its efforts to recover its influence everywhere—but especially its influence *here*, so long impaired by the misfortunes of the see and the interruption of intercourse during the war. By-and-bye the Protestants of the Continent began to understand pretty generally that the confidence which Rome had been enjoying was but that which credulous man is apt to repose in a slumbering volcano. No change, however took place in the conduct or arguments of our modern emancipators. These mainly consisted in an exaggerated dread of the power of the Irish Papists, and affected contempt for the moral power of Popery. It was assumed to be a worn-out superstition, which, when not kept alive by persecution, must languish and die. In England, it was said, there were a few people of condition whom an honourable punctilio alone attached to a proscribed Church. In Ireland the strength of the priests lay in their sway over a barbarous population; soothe the masters, and the slaves must cease to be formidable. How little did these enlightened reasoners know of human nature when they supposed that vanity and ambition can be pampered without being stimulated; or that Popery, containing, as it does, the substance of eternal truth, and overlaid with fictions so marvellously adapted to man's weakness and corruption, could be thus disposed of by a pointed sentence of a "liberal" harangue!

By such arguments and with such expectations the Relief Bill was violently urged on; the opposition to it was suddenly abandoned, by those who alone could oppose it—and it was carried. No one attempted to grapple with the true difficulties of the question. By one party they were denied; by another they were thought insuperable. The one demanded the simple removal of all disabilities; the other did not think themselves bound to provide the correctives for a measure they disapproved *in toto*. . . . It may be true that if, as was urged at the time, it was *necessary* to hurry on the Relief Bill without delay, it would hardly have been possible for its framers to engraft on it a suitable and well-weighed scheme of restriction, it is perhaps more true that the temper of the country, already sorely tried, could not have been expected to endure at that crisis the additional novelty of a formal negotiation with Rome. We only profess to declare what should, from the first, have been the object of our emancipating guides. We maintain that the alternative was never fairly stated to the country. The choice, as it should have been proposed, lay between the restrictive laws as then in force, and the removal of those laws *with* the imposition of such other restrictions as had been admitted in various European States, and as the circumstances of this country rendered peculiarly necessary in her case. . . . Up to the passing of the Relief Bill all was at least consistent. No interference of the Pope was, in theory, permitted; his very existence was ignored by the law. Now that the emancipation was complete, and his access to his own adherents unrestrained, to persist for the sake of nominal and fallacious consistency to ignore the Pope, was to confer upon him the plenitude of ecclesiastical power, unbounded in theory as the wildest claims of the dark ages could extend, and limited in practice only by his own discretion. Such an arrangement, or rather abrogation of all arrangement, could not long admit of peace even in an united country where the Roman Catholic religion was dominant; could it bring peace to one torn with dissensions, where another was the religion of the State? Sooner or later a collision between the Crown and the head of the Romish Church was inevitable; whether the Ministers who reluctantly passed this measure would or could have subsequently devised any efficient safeguards for it was never put to proof: they soon yielded their places to its most strenuous advocates, and beneath the fostering influence of those successors the fruits of "Emancipation" rapidly expanded and matured. Under ordinary circumstances, the unfettered action of ecclesiastical authority is as galling to the Romish laity as it is incompatible with the free action of government; but, in the presence of a Protestant power and nation, clergy and laity agreed admirably in keeping up the agitation they had repeatedly promised to abandon for ever. The influential laity indeed—the demagogues, by whom, as well as by the priests, the unhappy peasants were cajoled, inflamed, and plundered—had the dexterity to secure the more substantial fruits of victory to themselves. Mr. O'Connell received, as his share, besides the rent, the command of a following strong enough to balance the parties of the imperial legislature; and by the compact of January, 1835, the whole patronage of Ireland was laid at his feet. The priests, for the most part, were paid with fawning genuflexions and such honours as—*proh pudor!*—could be extorted from the time-serving Ministers of a Prince still styling himself the Defender of the Faith. Every year the embarrassments of Government increased; every year fresh concessions were sought for, and made, with the effect that might have been anticipated, of raising fresh hopes and exciting new demands.

Among their endeavours to gratify the pride which they had thus weakly inflamed, the most extraordinary

was the plan to confer surreptitiously, and without any direct act of the competent authorities, title and precedence upon the chiefs of the Popish priesthood in the colonies and in Ireland. In 1845, when this invasion was first noticed in Parliament, Lord John Russell had the boldness to say in his place:—"I believe that we may [that is, *we should*] repeal those disallowing clauses which prevent a Roman Catholic bishop from assuming a title held by a bishop of the Establishment. Nothing can be more absurd and perilous than to keep up such distinctions." This was indeed a candid proclamation! The scheme, accordingly, was persisted in, and by-and-bye we exposed it so fully that we should not revert to it, if the subject had not recently acquired such additional importance in public estimation. We tried then to impress our readers with our own apprehensions—we have now to lament their fulfilment. We shall make some extracts, and we must begin with Lord Grey's celebrated circular addressed to the Governors of the British Colonies:—

"Downing-street, Nov. 20, 1847.

"SIR,—My attention has lately been called by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to the fact, that the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in the British colonies have not hitherto, in their official correspondence with the Governor and authorities, been usually addressed by the title to which their rank in their own Church would appear to give them a just claim. Formerly there were obvious reasons for this practice; but as Parliament has, by a recent Act (that relating to Charitable Bequests in Ireland), formally recognised the rank of the Irish Roman Catholic prelates, by giving them precedence immediately after the prelates of the Established Church of the same degree—the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops taking rank immediately after the Protestant archbishops and bishops respectively—it has appeared to *her Majesty's Government* that it is their duty to conform to the rule thus laid down by the Legislature; and I have accordingly to instruct you hereafter officially to address the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in your Government by the title of *Your Grace*, or *Your Lordship*, as the case may be.

"Parliament not having thought proper to sanction the assumption by the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland of titles derived from the *sees which they hold*, a similar rule will be followed in the colonies; thus, for example, the Roman Catholic prelate in New South Wales will be addressed as the Most Reverend Archbishop Polding, and in Van Diemen's Land as the Right Rev. Bishop Willson.

"I have, &c.

GREY."

The Protestants in the House of Commons had a natural anxiety to see a document in which Lord Clarendon, finding himself at leisure to divert his mind to the care of the antipodes, and not feeling satisfied with Lord Grey's attention to Popish interests in that remote quarter, had thought proper to jog his noble friend's memory. Accordingly, Sir Robert Inglis moved for the Lord Lieutenant's letter—but, behold! it had no official existence! The return from the Colonial-office was *nil*. It seems surprising that Lord Grey should have quoted a private letter as the ground for an official despatch, or, having so quoted it, did not perceive that it thereby became official, and public property. Several expressions in the "Circular" were also most remarkable, especially the tranquil observation that "Parliament had not thought proper to sanction" the Popish prelates in Ireland in "the assumption of titles from the *dioceses which they hold*." But all surprise is swallowed up in what follows.

In the House of Lords, 8th August, 1848, Lord Redesdale said, the Charitable Bequests Act had been relied on under a total mistake, and "The mistake, he conceived, had arisen from the fact that, whereas the Act merely authorised a Commission, consisting of the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Baron, the Judge of the Prerogative Court, and ten other persons, five of whom were to be Roman Catholics—in the 'Queen's Letter' placing those persons on the Commission, it so happened that after the name of the Protestant archbishop the Roman Catholic archbishop's name next, and so on, after every Protestant bishop there was a Roman Catholic bishop named. But every one knew that names were placed upon Commissions without any reference to the precedence of rank; as, for instance, in the Treasury, where it often happened that the first Lord Commissioner was a commoner, while the junior lords might be persons of much higher rank. The explanation of the arrangement so made in this Commission appears in the very Act quoted by the noble lord in his circular. The Master of the Rolls, the Chief Baron, and the Judge, in the order of their rank, if present, were to act as official chairmen of the Commission, and in their absence one of the ten others, in order of their *appointment*. With regard to these, if all the Protestants had been placed first on the Commission, and all the Roman Catholics last, it is quite clear that it would be impossible for any of the latter ever to have a chance of occupying the chair at their meetings in the absence of the official chairman. It was, therefore, in order to make a fair distribution of the chance of filling the chair that the arrangement of the names had been settled."

Lord Stanley added—"The noble earl had stated in a despatch that Parliament had, in the Bequests Act, expressly recognised the rank of the Roman Catholic prelates, and that it was the duty of her Majesty's Government to conform to the rule laid down by the Legislature. The fact was, that no such recognition had been made, no such rule laid down. The fact was, there was not one word from beginning to end of the Act with regard to the precedence of prelates of the Roman Catholic Church; and that, although her Majesty, in the exercise of her undoubted authority, had thought fit, in appointing the Commissioners under that Act, to give, for the purposes of that Act, a certain position in that Commission to certain individual prelates, and to none other, yet those prelates had no precedence whatever as to rank beyond the doors of the Commission, nor had any other Roman Catholic prelate the slightest precedence or position of the kind in consequence either of the provisions of the Act or of the arrangements under the Commission."

Thus both allegations were for ever abolished. But as we cannot suppose that Lord Grey was aware of the falseness of the grounds he alleged, so we do not believe that he had considered how indefensible in form, in principle, and in law, was the course he pursued. He does not seem to have known that there cannot be canonically two bishops of the same diocese, and that to acknowledge the *holding* of the one is to disallow that of the other. He is as willing to grant the style of Your Grace to two archbishops of Dublin as that of Reverend to two Dissenting ministers in his own county, whose votes he wishes to secure. He does not care that the Pope, by giving the title of archbishop to his hierarchs, may at pleasure secure for them superior consideration to bishops, even to archbishops, of the Established Church. Lastly, he seems to think that the Colonial Secretary is the fountain of honour, and that it is not even necessary for that potentate to use the form of "having taken her Majesty's pleasure."

If the result were not so serious, it might provoke a smile to consider the effects of this sweeping appropriation of lofty titles, and on what sort of persons these two modest earls had bestowed the style of "Your Grace," peculiarly English, unknown (if that signifies) and having no equivalent in the Romish Church abroad—not even in Italy. We know not whether Lord Grey's prejudices have blinded his perceptions, or whether the badness of his cause obliges him to mystify his defence. He seems to see everything indistinctly, as through a mist of his own raising. Characteristically enough, he makes a parade throughout of the contempt which certain statesmen are accustomed to profess for what they call trifles. Lord John Russell, in like manner, in the House of Commons, expressly recommended passing from the subject because it was, "after all, of no importance:" he was still of opinion, that is, after the lapse of three years, that any objection to such steps was "puerile and absurd." "When the substance is given up, why quarrel about the shadow?" is a phrase much in vogue with politicians of this stamp. They might learn better from the only Church which they seem to admire. What they call the *shadow* often involves the *principle*. It is by catching at such shadows, and never relinquishing them, that the Church of Rome became what she is—a power still able to agitate this country from one end to the other; and truly in our own immediate case the shadow plays no unimportant part. It has consolidated itself into the portly substance of a Cardinal-Primate of all England and twelve suffragan bishops "holding" English sees.

We must refer our readers to Mr. Perceval's pamphlet, if they wish to see collected together all that wit and argument in and out of Parliament were able to urge against the Cabinet on this occasion. We say the Cabinet, for it was not by silent support alone, but by entire agreement in sentiment and in language with the two Earls, that all the Ministers, and especially the Premier, declared their concurrence. But if we were to select the passage which we consider least creditable to the noble Secretary, and yet most important for the public to reflect upon, we should take it from his own defence. Lord Grey, in reply to Lord Redesdale, said—"It was perfectly true that the Bequests Act did not expressly recognise the rank of Roman Catholic prelates; and that, in writing the despatch, he had undoubtedly taken somewhat hastily the expression used in the letter of his noble friend the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to him on the subject. Yet, though the language of the circular was, to a certain degree, inaccurate, it was, at the same time, substantially correct."

And how does he make this out? Lo! he has a new document in his bag:—"An Act of Parliament, though it was a private act, still was no less an act of the Legislature. In the Dublin Cemeteries Act he found a Roman Catholic Archbishop styled the Most Reverend Archbishop Murray; and in the same act, which was passed in 1846, Dr. Murray was styled his Grace. It should be recollected that the despatch [the famous circular] did not give a rank, but merely recognised a rank already recognised by law. . . . He believed that it was an unfortunate circumstance that the title of my Lord should be given to bishops either of our own or of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . In some colonies the English Church was no more established than the Roman Catholic; in many of the colonies the Roman Catholics formed the great majority of the population; and it appeared to him that it was contrary to all justice and reason, that in such cases the title accorded to the prelates of the one religion should not be given also to those of the other."

We need not call admiration to the coolness with which this nobleman of very recent nobility decries the titles conceded immemorably by the Constitution to our own episcopal bench to be "unfortunate." But we must pause for a moment on the "private act, not the less an act of the Legislature," which he digs up to supply the gap left by his demolished Bequests Act. "A private act, forsooth?"—exclaims a writer frequently quoted by Mr. Perceval—"of which, most probably, not a single Member of Parliament, except those in the secret, ever read more than the title; though it is now clear enough, from the use which Lord Grey has been put up to make of it, that this clandestine march was stolen upon the country and upon Parliament with *malice prepense* of the Romish hierarchy."—*Morning Herald*, Aug. 22, 1848.

The all-important clause of this private act is in these words:—"XXVIII.—Be it enacted, that his Grace Daniel Murray, Archbishop, and his successors exercising the same spiritual jurisdiction as he now exercises in the diocese of Dublin as an archbishop, may from time to time appoint, at the desire of the said governing body, a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church to officiate as a chaplain in any such burial-grounds, and such chaplain shall be licensed by and be subject to the jurisdiction of the said archbishop, and the said archbishop shall have power to revoke any such licence, and to remove such chaplain, for any cause which shall appear to the said archbishop to be canonical!"

Mr. Perceval's commentary is this:—"If Lord Grey's argument from the private act being the act of the Legislature be worth a straw, this most improper recital and enactment in an obscure private bill has virtually repealed the Act of Supremacy, and falsified the oaths of every Protestant Peer and Member of Parliament. For, beyond all question, Daniel Murray's spiritual jurisdiction is the Pope's! Roman Catholic prelates have no jurisdiction but of the Pope's giving. They are but vicars of the universal bishop. This private act, therefore, proves something too much."

Mr. Perceval does not point out all the importance of this precedent of 1846—if it is to pass for one—as respects the "Aggression" of 1850; but, as he justly says, the mere existence of such a private act is a circumstance well worthy public attention. Who drew the act? Can any one doubt that it was a Popish sub-official—or a Popish prelate, his real master? It is high time the country should learn the circumspection that is required when honesty and plain dealing are not to be depended upon in public servants. In these days, when no lawyer can keep pace with the torrent of legislation on public matters which rolls through Parliament, we discover that every obscure private bill must be watched in its progress, lest it should contain some clause that virtually repeals the constitution. . . .

We must here notice another occurrence prior to the discussions of August, 1848, but which has only very lately been made *publici juris*. On the 19th of March, 1848, the Earl of Clarendon addressed a letter "to his Grace Archbishop Murray of Dublin," in which he said,—("Private.) My dear Lord—Your Grace had the goodness to promise that you would convey to Rome, for the consideration of the Pope, the amended statutes of the Queen's Colleges. As I entertain a profound veneration for the character of the Pope, and completely rely upon his upright judgment, it is with pleasure that I now ask your Grace," &c. &c.

Now, we beg to remind our readers that Lord Palmerston, when questioned on the 10th of December, 1847, as to the alleged accreditation of Lord Minto as an Envoy to the Court of Rome, replied that

Lord Minto had not been so accredited "in any way"—her Majesty's Government having "too much respect for the law to do anything which could by possibility be considered an infringement of it." Such was Lord Palmerston's view of the law. He strenuously defended the Government against the suspicion that they had ventured, as the law then stood, to open any intercourse with the Court of Rome. The act of Queen Victoria authorising diplomatic intercourse with the Sovereign of the Roman States—*quâ* temporal Sovereign merely—was, after many debates, passed at the very close of the session in 1848 (Sept. 3.). Yet in March previous here is the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland asking "his Grace Archbishop Murray of Dublin" to convey to Rome for the consideration of the Pope, upon whose upright judgment his Excellency has implicit reliance, the statutes drawn up by her Majesty's responsible servants for the new colleges then meditated. . . .

In spite of all these things, one might have expected that the debates of August, 1848, respecting Lord Grey's circular, would have instilled a little caution; but not so. The same course was resumed. It is by no one avowed act of the Legislature, nor of the royal prerogative, that this innovation has been accomplished. It was promoted by a succession of ministerial manœuvres, advancing like the gradual and scarcely perceptible rising of an inundation, till at last (one error supporting and confirming another), on occasion of the Queen's visit to Ireland, there appeared in the *Dublin Gazette* the following notice:—

"*Lord Chamberlain's Office, Dublin Castle, August 7, 1849.*—Her Majesty has been pleased to desire that the following persons should have the *entrée* to the Castle:—The Primate, the Chancellor, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Roman Catholic Primate, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the Duke of Leinster, the Cabinet Ministers, her Majesty's Household, the Lord-Lieutenant's Household, the Lord Chief Justice of Queen's Bench, the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas, the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, &c., &c., and all who have the *entrée* at St. James's."

A small circumstance marks the deliberate and general prospective purpose of this notice. In August, 1850, there was no "Roman Catholic Primate." The "throne" of Armagh was vacant until filled in 1850 by the Pope's nomination of his "philosopher and friend" Dr. Cullen. The Primate therefore was mentioned with a view to the Court arrangements of futurity. This was meant to be a settlement *in perpetuum* of the precedence of Dublin Castle; nor could it be questioned that it was also meant that Popish prelates admitted to such precedence there would have a full right to claim similar rank on any visit to her Majesty's Court at St. James's.

It may well seem idle, after these occurrences, to express any surprise at the English bull of 1850. Undoubtedly the way for it had been well smoothed; as far as Ministers were concerned, the Pope might be excused for believing that his "aggression" would be anything but unacceptable. But his Holiness, though infallible, had forgotten an important item to be calculated, and discarded for once the wisdom of the serpent. Having, as he had, friends here, who plotted for him with a zeal and a disingenuousness which his own Court could hardly surpass, it does seem an act of wondrous folly on his part, and should be received as a deliverance on ours, that he himself chose suddenly to expose to the whole English nation the lines of attack so ingeniously concealed. The Pope's indiscretion, however, leaves Dr. Wiseman's *argumentum ad hominem* against Ministers quite untouched; nor, on the other hand, will it avail them, when the immediate excitement shall have subsided, to say, in humble imitation of their eminent ally, that the bull of Pius IX. was mainly prompted by recent manifestations within our own Church. At present, certainly, the signal on this head has been obeyed with great apparent alacrity. On every side we hear the same strain:—May not our own divisions be justly regarded as the great cause of the arrogance of our enemies? When the zeal which should be exerted on the substance of religion is allowed to waste itself on idle forms; when disputes about doctrines too mysterious for human comprehension, and too subtle to be defined by articles or settled by controversy, make us forget the main and plain points on which we all agree; when Anglican clergymen, even dignitaries, seem to tamper with the keystone of the Establishment—the supremacy of the Sovereign; when there is a party in the Church who ery up the religion over which Pius IX. presides, and calumniate the Reformation which our forefathers blessed as the escape from the house of bondage—is it wonderful that the "successor of St. Peter" should assault a power which even its own servants do not respect and defend?

In Rome, the conversions to Popery have, no doubt, been much exaggerated both as to their number and importance. No doubt also the "Romanising tendencies" of a section of our clergy have been misrepresented by half-foreign priests and fantastical converts, who never, perhaps, imbibed the spirit of the creed and ritual they have abjured, and who, we will be bold to say, have everything to learn (as they will hereafter find to their cost, on a nearer view) of the Church they have embraced. Of what has been said on these unhappy topics, however, enough is true to cause a severe pain and excite a just alarm. What we wonder at is the audacity of the Whig Ministers in venturing to start such a strain. In what, we must ask, did the Tractarian movement originate? Whose acts provoked it? Is Lord John Russell in this case entitled to throw the first stone?

The Whig Government of 1830 included not a few individually hostile to the Church, and all as a party were unfriendly to it. They came in "with a cry," in pursuit of popularity; they believed the Church was unpopular because the dissenters were noisy; and they immeasurably underrated her strength. The Establishment appeared to be really in danger, and the alarm was powerfully sounded by one of their own warmest partisans, who had never been accused of bigoted attachment to the Church, and whose nerves did not seem particularly sensitive to the danger of innovation. Bishops were appointed who, whatever might be their merits, did not command the confidence of the clergy. Their doctrines had given offence to many, and their advancement spread and strengthened the conviction that it was the intention of the Government to favour latitudinarian principles to the utmost of their power. Ministers seemed anxious to mark that their indulgence extended beyond even the pale of Christianity; the proposal to admit the Jews into Parliament was honoured with their zealous approbation. Is it surprising that earnest and zealous men united to oppose the torrent which threatened the Church of England, and to propagate her doctrines in all their original force and purity, as the best means of resisting her latitudinarian foes? The *Tracts* began in 1833. The first of them was an address to the clergy, demanding if they meant, as a body, to let their bishops alone stand the battle proclaimed by the then Lord Grey's memorable speech about "setting houses in order?" It was not until far on in the series that any tenets were announced which could offend the most

orthodox churchman. We do not lay upon the successive ministries, in which Lord John Russell has held a prominent place, the blame of the melancholy follies which this party have subsequently committed; by no means; the reaction in favour of antiquity is generally felt, and has produced extravagances in matters of much less importance. Fopperies of ill-understood archæology might, no doubt, have crept at any rate into our churches, and very possibly some dreamy enthusiasts might have gratified their vanity or a "morbid taste for externals" by going over to Rome. But the solidity and consistency of the party, with a definite and laudable object, which gave them at first the support of good and able men, are to be attributed to that war upon the Church which the Reform Premier proclaimed, and which the Whig chiefs have since carried on with no other intermission than that produced by occasional want of power. Nor was this power always wanting when they were out of place. Can we forget what use they made of their leisure in December, 1834, and January, 1835? Can we forget that in those months were held the consultations between Irish papistry and English innovation which resulted in the Lichfield House Compact? Or can we consider it as a circumstance of no significance that Dr. Wiseman now states that the first petitions for the establishment of a regular hierarchy in England were sent from London to Rome "sixteen years ago?" To what period does that date bring us? Is it possible not to suspect that those petitioners obeyed the same directors who were exactly then preparing an assault of unprecedented violence upon the Anglican Establishment in Ireland, and with whom English intriguers were content to take counsel at Lichfield House? Or, considering how close the alliance between our ruling Whigs and the chief instruments of papal policy in this empire continued to be from "sixteen years ago," and more, to August, 1849, and later—is it possible to doubt the accuracy of Dr. Wiseman's reiterated assertion, that nothing was farther from his expectation than the appearance, on the late occasion, of such a document as the letter to the Bishop of Durham, signed by Lord John Russell?

That remarkable letter, however, was not, even on the face of patent documents, the noble Premier's first move. Originally he took the matter very philosophically. When, three years back, his attention was called, in the House of Commons, to the universal report as to the erection of the Westminster primacy, he contented himself with curtly replying that he had received no information of such an arrangement, nor, if he had been informed, would he "have approved of it." He did not say that he would have boiled over with "indignation," and forthwith set about examining into the state of the penal laws. No. But this was long ago; and the bull had not been actually issued! Well, even on the first promulgation of the Wiseman bull, he (October 28, 1850) in the same calm laconic style of eloquence announced to a favoured "gentleman of Exeter," by the pen of his secretary, that the Government had "not given sanction or approbation" to the scheme thus propounded from the chair of St. Peter; but still not a note of antidote or resistance! By and bye he found that both above and below him the matter was regarded more seriously! Mighty indeed in working was the brief interval between October 28th and November 4th, when he addressed the Bishop of Durham. By that time he had taken alarm—for *what* we need not ask; and, ingeniously attributing the "insolent and insidious aggression" to the unchecked spread of Tractarian delusions, declares his high scorn of all "mummeries," and his resolve that if the law will reach the intrusive Papists it shall be put in force; if it will not, it must be amended! *Et tu, Brute!*

No Minister ever stood in a more pitiable position. But the movement has advanced far beyond the control of such "weak masters"—and something must be done. That the law would still reach the "Cardinal-Archbishop" and his suffragans, is hardly, after the speech of Sir F. Sugden, doubtful. It is not, perhaps, so generally known how this happens to be so. The fact is, that the bill of 9th and 10th Victoria, as prepared by Mr. Anstey (a Roman Catholic lawyer and M.P.), approved and supported by Lord John Russell, and agreed to by the House of Commons, repealed the Acts of the 1st and 13th of Elizabeth *in toto*; but the sagacity of the Bishop of Exeter detected the possible consequences of such extreme liberality, and his amendment was carried in the Lords: whereby, although the statutory penalties of the old Acts were abolished, their substance was retained; so that their infringers are still liable to all the consequences of *misdeemeanour*. Many, no doubt, would be desirous to see the powers with which the course preserved statutes invest Government again enforced. But, whatever difficulties there may be in such a course, the greatest, we imagine, would be in inducing Lords Grey and Clarendon to co-operate. A hard case indeed is theirs, if they must either consent to do so, or abandon their posts because *conscience* forbids them to defend the cause of religion and patriotism.

Still, we repeat, something must be done: to whatever a few dignified Whigs may be committed, the country is unanimously resolved not to submit to what she regards as both an insult and an injury; and Lord John Russell must have more courage than even Sydney Smith ascribed to him if he, after his letter to Bishop Maltby, dares to meet Parliament without some measure in his hand. In fact, to do so would certainly be to pronounce sentence of immediate deposition against himself, and, we need not add, against the Ministry. The only other men of active talent and bold temper in his Cabinet are about as unpopular as it is possible for statesmen to be. The Colonial-office and the Foreign-office have reduced themselves to such esteem that it is hard to say whether the Premier would suffer most by being thought to yield, on a great point of domestic policy, to the one of their chiefs, or to lean principally, in an adherence to it, upon the support of the other.

Something must be done; something must at least be attempted: what that something will be, it is not our business to conjecture; but we greatly fear it will turn out to be a something as inadequate to the exigency of the case and expectation of the community, as fatal (which, in fact, any measure, however timorous, must be) to the consistency of our rulers. Nor, however feeble and ineffectual, could it fail to encounter a formidable combination of Parliamentary factions. One English section, we can already see will be for allowing matters to remain as they are on the plea of "peace;" another will swell the inevitable Irish cry that the slightest movement in the shape of resistance involves the heinousness of persecution. The meaning is much the same. Peace is not to be got by passive submission to acts of warfare; there is no persecution in endeavouring, in a country where there are many diversities of faith, to place Church matters on such a footing that the different dissenting bodies may hold each its own way, without perpetual risks of collision, either with each other or with the religion which is still that of the Crown and State. But the truth is, the whole of this opposition will be found to resolve itself into a continuation of that hostility to the Established Church—the 'United Church of England and Ireland'—which has been felt, for these twenty years, to be

a cardinal motive of Whig policy. To the *ultramontane* representatives of Irish constituencies we have little to say—they will be fighting for a cause which they will avow, and which the principles instilled into them by their confessors have satisfied them that they may conscientiously (though to other men's views they violate oaths) avow and uphold with the utmost of that power which the Relief Bill left to be exercised by them under no control save that of their own discretion and honour. Their English allies, Mr. Roebuck, for instance, will not probably speak out so plainly. The *ultramontanist* strains every nerve to ruin our Church, because his hope is strong that, were she degraded, the Protestants, reduced to a chaos of unprivileged sects, would be unable to resist the disciplined force of the Vatican; that multitudes of Anglicans would in such a state of matters seek for shelter under the ægis of the Infallible See, firm in a polity independent of local arrangements; that the feelings which have hitherto made the main strength of our Church would be largely enlisted on the side of Rome; and that, after an interval of anarchy, the result would be her formal supremacy even in England. Never, we believe, were visions more baseless. The people of England, long accustomed to religious freedom, will not again place their necks beneath the sandals of monks. "The morbid taste for externals" is confined to a few idle and susceptible individuals of the upper classes, who seek for occupation in religious excitement and a new amusement in the pauses of hackneyed dissipation—the mass of the people is *here* untainted. The destruction of the Church of England *here* would neither be the triumph of Rome nor of Belgravia; but from the ruins of all would spring up those stern and relentless sectarians who once before overthrew the monarchy, and who would preach universal toleration till one of them was strong enough to practice persecution. The English latitudinarian—to say nothing of the sheer infidel—does not perhaps look so far. It might be curious to speculate on what his feelings would be if suddenly transferred to a land where the Papal system enjoyed a complete dominancy. With what zeal would Mr. Roebuck then denounce the absurdities of the dogmas, the insolence of the priests, the slavery of the teaching; what barricades, what violence, would he not recommend to get rid of the abomination: what pains and penalties would he think too much for its instruments? But meanwhile his eye is kept fixed on the one eyesore—the existing Church establishment: and in his hatred of one bishop for a diocese the Member for Bath would gladly see two. No matter that the one priesthood is, in all its ranks, bound by every interest to peace and order, the other to turbulence and sedition. Treat both alike, let them neutralise each other: in the struggle we shall get rid of both!

Lastly, of course, there will not be wanting those who discover a conclusive argument for inaction in the series of concessions already sketched; but we must again warn such reasoners that, with whatever ease they expose the folly of successive Cabinets, and the incapacity of Lord John Russell's to renege with any show of justice, the matter is now taken into the hands of the nation, and the nation will assuredly not permit it to be skimmed over merely from tenderness for a few traders in politics. Nor, after all, considering the Pope as a substantive power, can even the imbecility that endured all his prior encroachments afford any justification for *him*.

When the statute of supremacy was re-enacted in the first year of Elizabeth—that is, upon our final rupture with Rome—a war of destruction as against infidels was declared by the Papal See. On such occasions, its pretensions, which during a period of amity have submitted to the restrictions imposed by usage or policy, rise instantly to their full extravagance, and employ such weapons of offence as circumstances suggest, and the spirit of the age allows. In those days no weapons were held to be unlawful; and when the Legislature passed the restrictive statutes, especially those forbidding every sort of intercourse with Rome, and exacting the abjuration of that "damnable and heretical doctrine" that subjects might be absolved from their allegiance, and the deposition of Sovereigns—even their assassination—sanctified by a decree of the Pope—it did no more than was necessary to protect Elizabeth and her successors from incessant machinations against their crowns and persons. When we changed the dynasty in 1689 the Pope was, and he continued to be, the chief ally and prop of the exiled house; every Papist was a suspected conspirator against the Protestant succession. It was not till after the failure of the last attempt to restore the Stuarts that a subsidence of the long-continued hostilities between this country and Rome took place, and gradually consolidated into a *truce*, uncovenanted in terms, but by every year's prescription acquiring more and more the force, and at all events inspiring the confidence, of a written agreement. *The basis of this truce was the UTI POSSIDETIS.* The Pope withdrew no claim, but he desisted from all interference, except such as was necessary for the direction of his flock! At the date of the truce his Irish bishops were found in the exact position of their predecessors prior to the madneses of James II. There existed no such bishops in England, and he made no attempt to create them. He accepted, when under the pressure of French despotism, the assistance of Great Britain; at the restoration of European peace many courtesies and civilities were interchanged between him and the Crown. The first encroachment respected our colonies, but this was at least palliated in the outset by our own neglect of the interests of our Church in them. Rome saw us allow them to multiply and grow without taking any care for planting in them our own ecclesiastical system; and the apparent indifference with which her first steps were observed, added to the long-continued abandonment of our own duty, might be considered as some proof that in that direction the empire was willing to acquiesce in her measures. Then came the erection of a new see (Galway) in Ireland—a step which would certainly have attracted much notice under ordinary circumstances; but it occurred in 1831, when the whole nation were in the fever of the Reform Bill; it therefore passed literally without observation. Finally, even as to the subsequent concessions of title and precedence to the Pope's Irish and colonial prelates—however weighty the argument drawn from them by Dr. Wiseman against the Whigs, however we are bound to admit that they might naturally encourage the Court of Rome to believe that it would carry the sentiment of our present rulers with it in further innovations—we must repeat that these concessions were, in spite of all the sophistries of Lord Grey, ministerial, not legislative; and insist that, grossly inculpating a knot of partisans, they can avail but little for the defence of the Pontiff of 1850.

It is something, after all, that those surreptitious steps were taken in respect of our outlying dependencies. It does not follow, because faithless stewards have encouraged, and a careless landlord has winked at, squatting on the skirts of his chase, that *he* will feel himself bound to tolerate the cutting up of his garden into lots, or the demand of a lodgment in his manor-house. The invasion of *England* was an

egregious novelty—a monstrous inroad; by that, at least, the *truce* of a hundred years was openly trampled under foot—there could no longer be any pretence that the *Uti Possidetis* had not been violently disturbed. All the advocates of quiescence, from Dr. Wiseman to Lord St. Germans, assume that the Pope does and can exercise his authority in no other way than that which he has now adopted with respect to us. This, however, is not the fact. If it were, no doubt the fact would much embarrass the opposite side; but that he has other means, and can use them when he pleases, our own experience proves; and no one is better aware how the case stands than Dr. Wiseman, though we can readily believe that Lord St. Germans has not considered matters so closely.

Since, then, the truce is at an end, what remains for our election? We think one of two things only—War, or a Treaty of Peace. Now war, either in the shape of hostilities against the feebleness of all temporal princes, or in the shape of the summary re-enactment of the severe penal laws, whereby to compel our Romish fellow-subjects back into the condition of their grandfathers, this is, we need not say, utterly a dream. No such measures would be endured by Parliament, nor, even at this moment, excited as it is, by the British people. The alternative is peace—a treaty—a solemn and distinct engagement as between two sovereign powers. The “*dilemma*” stated by Lord St. Germans has, we believe, disturbed many temperate minds. We admire the adroitness of the noble logician, but he does not touch our convictions. He says:—“The supremacy of the Queen, that is, her authority as head of the Church, is as much part and parcel of the constitution of the Church in Ireland as in England. Anything which, if done in England, would constitute an aggression on the supremacy of the Queen, must equally constitute an aggression on it if done in Ireland. Parliament, in proceeding to legislate on the subject, will therefore find itself in this dilemma; either it must prohibit in England that which it permits in Ireland, or it must prohibit in Ireland that which has been immemorably done in that country without let or hindrance.”

We admit the great difficulty and delicacy of such legislation as Lord St. Germans contemplates; but we think he has perplexed himself and others unnecessarily by confounding very different things. Tolerance and Permission, which he takes for convertible terms, are by no means such. That which is prohibited may be tolerated—it cannot be permitted. Every truce on the principle of *uti possidetis* must include the tolerance of many anomalies: these must remain till they are set to rights by some definite arrangement: both parties are bound in honour to leave them as they are meanwhile. Interference with them by the solitary act of either is *aggression*, and breaks the truce. The noble earl’s *dilemma* rests, therefore, on nothing but oblivion or suppression of the existence of the truce between us and Rome; and he is wholly unwarranted in arguing either that a tolerance in Ireland, which made part of the *uti possidetis*, ties us up from repelling an aggressive innovation as to England; or that, the principle of *uti possidetis* having been set aside by the Pope’s own deed, our Legislature is not at full liberty to take up the whole question *de novo*, and proceed to rectify the grand omission, which neither Pitt nor Grenville ever contemplated, but which was made by the hasty Ministers of 1829.

We, at least, do not believe that any mere Bill passed by the British Parliament would have been effective for that purpose even at the commencement of the century; still less that it would be effective now. One thing, however, is quite clear—that, supposing the attempt towards a settlement to be made by a statute, we shall gain but little if it deal only with the outward and visible signs of recent aggression. If the enemy is not to be disarmed, it signifies little to hinder his marching with beaten drums and flying colours. This new aggression is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Relief Bill; we shall certainly take nothing by any new bill which shall not do what that unfortunate bill wholly eschewed—establish the necessary restrictions upon the administration of the Romish Church *within this empire*—such restrictions as are to be found in operation in every other European State but this. To such regulations no Romanist really faithful in heart to his Sovereign and the Constitution can reasonably object. It is happily seen that some of the most respectable adherents of that religion are prepared to stand by the body of their countrymen against the overweening presumption of the Roman Court. Let us repeat once more that we ought to be exceedingly thankful for the late excess to which that presumption has been tempted. But for this, one encroachment might have followed another until we had grown completely callous and case-hardened, or accepted submission as an inevitable destiny. It is not yet, we hope, too late to profit by the warning that has been rashly afforded to us. We must seize this opportunity for giving ourselves a chance at least of internal tranquillity for England; of repose and civilisation for Ireland. Ireland is the main and permanent consideration. The insult which has raised the country from one end to the other is the rattle of the snake, but it is idle to think of silencing the rattle by cutting off the tail; it is the bite that is fatal. We must find an antidote to the poison. We well know how offensive the mention of a *Concordat* will be at present. Few, perhaps, call to mind from how early a date such treaties have been found necessary. The series can be traced distinctly from A.D. 1122 to the settlement of the modern kingdom of the Netherlands; and to them Europe has owed the far greater share of such ecclesiastical peace as she has ever enjoyed. Among the innumerable pamphlets and speeches called forth on this occasion, we have not observed a treaty alluded to as the possible solution, except in the one very statesmanlike reply of the Bishop of Norwich to his clergy; and that allusion was fiercely rebuked in newspapers justly respected for their consistent Protestantism. Nevertheless, we confidently anticipate that, when the present fever is allayed, it will be gradually apprehended by the good sense of the nation that there is no other measure which can promise even a chance of ultimate repose. It is very probable that the enforcement or imposition of some restrictions, by direct authority of Parliament, may be in the first place wise and expedient: a negotiation could not be brought to a rapid conclusion; something may be necessary at once to allay the irritation of Protestants, and to check the arrogance of Romanists, and so by degrees predispose both parties to an accommodation. Restrictions, however, we firmly believe, can be of no real value any further than as they may tend to the consummation so devoutly to be wished—a *Concordat*.

till this morning to see if it would appear ; but the editor, with unheard-of injustice, not only has not inserted it, but had it in his hands long before he published his false leading article, carrying on the attack against me ; making the malice more apparent.

G. R. C.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,—I have seen, with indignation, an extract from a speech of a Mr. Rochfort Clarke, quoted in a letter signed "Gentilis Homo," which appeared in your journal of the 4th instant.

In ordinary cases, perhaps, any notice of so vile a fiction would be unnecessary ; but considering that the author seems to hold some station, and was approvingly listened to by many who should know better, I deem that a few facts may not be out of place for the future guidance of such orators and such an auditory.

I have some right in this matter, as a relative of the venerable and distinguished lady assailed, with the history and descent of whose family I am conversant ; to say nothing of my feeling as to the exemplary virtues which have marked her life, and the place I hold in the friendship of her illustrious son.

The family name of Mrs. Wiseman, mother of the Cardinal, is Strange ; her name, Xaviera Strange, daughter of the late Peter Strange, Esq., of Aylwardstown Castle, in the barony of Ida, County Kilkenny. This has been an ancestral residence in the family for centuries, and has been the birth-place and home of Xaviera Strange and of her immediate ancestors, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, &c., during the past two hundred years. Although in this more fortunate than many of their relatives and friends among the plundered gentlemen and nobles who, like them, sustained the cause of King Charles, their lot was pretty nearly the same as regards their estates and possessions, which, for the most part, went as a prey to the Ponsonbys and other Cromwellian adventurers (Whigs in their infancy).

By an "*Inquisitio post mortem*," taken at the "Black Fryars," Kilkenny, about the 1st or 2nd of Charles I., it was found that Edward Strange died in January, 1621, seised of the manor at Dunkitt and other possessions enumerated, leaving sons and daughters, Richard Peter, John Thomas, Anastasia, and Margaret. This Edward Strange was the lineal ancestor of Mrs. Wiseman and of the present Lord Bellew, of Barmeath. The lands recited in this inquisition were ten years later declared a forfeiture, and granted by Cromwell to his fanatics and regicides ; which grants were afterwards, with barbarous ingratitude, confirmed by the "Acts of Settlement and Explanation," passed in the reign of Charles II.

By this act some scanty justice was rendered to a few of the Catholic gentlemen and nobles, whether holding by what were called "decrees of innocence," or as holders of Connaught certificates.

Richard Strange, named in the above inquisition, had, under this act, a grant of certain lands in the county Galway, which was intended as a miserable equivalent for the large confiscations in Leinster.

The name of this same Richard Strange (with the names of several noblemen and gentlemen) is affixed to "the remonstrance of loyalty" presented on their part to Charles II. by the Duke of Ormond. This remonstrance may be seen in the appendix to "Curry's Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland," Dublin edition, 1810, and attached to it "Richard Strange, of Rockswell Castle." He was great-grandfather of the late Lady Bellew, whose father was also Richard Strange, and to whom those Galway lands descended.

The branch of Mrs. Wiseman's family settled in Spain was long and well-known to the great banking and mercantile houses of London ; and her uncle, Mr. L. Strange, of Cadiz, was not more prized by them than the eminent house of Wiseman Brothers, of Seville, &c.

Without going back to remoter periods, I may confine myself to those authentic legal evidences to which I the more particularly refer, because in this country many mushroom peers and *quasi* gentlemen can have pedigrees manufactured to order.

Believe me to be, sir, your faithful servant,

FELIX FITZ-PATRICK.

8, Margaret-place, Mountjoy-square, Dublin, Jan. 9.

SERIES EIGHTEEN will contain the Bishop of Durham's Letter, and numerous other documents having reference to the measures about to be proposed to Parliament by her Majesty's Government.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

[Since the publication of the Note attached to the Twelfth Series of these Pamphlets, the Editor has received many very kind and suggestive communications. The general purport of them tend to press upon his attention the necessity of not concluding the Series until the important Speeches in both Houses of Parliament on this all-absorbing subject have appeared in its pages, and that the sum of Threehalfpence per Pamphlet should be fixed as a somewhat remunerative price for so many valuable documents on the question. The results of his deliberations are—that he will print these Speeches in the future portions of the Series—that the price will be Threehalfpence per sheet—and he hopes to be able to complete the Series in six more sheets. He will continue to keep for sale a supply of the seventeen previous sheets at 1d. each.]

The Editor regrets to inform Subscribers that Messrs. Richardson, the Catholic Publishers, have, in their alleged capacity of Proprietors of the Dublin Review, obtained from the Vice-Chancellor an ex parte injunction against the issue of the Seventeenth Series, which contains an article from this Review on the Hierarchical Question. As far as the Editor of these Pamphlets is concerned, the facts are as follow:—He felt the Series would be incomplete if this article were omitted. Now the article in the Dublin Review distinctly asserts and recognises the usefulness and importance of the present Series of Pamphlets. This, coupled with the fact of the approval and help he has received from ALL other parties, certainly did not lead him to expect that he should be subjected to the annoyance and expense of such proceedings, and from such a channel too; indeed, he cannot refrain from stating that if the Catholic body do not compel these proceedings to be cancelled, they will necessarily become participants in what the Editor must characterise as a most unjustifiable proceeding. Besides which, the publication of this very article was surely calculated to extend the dissemination of arguments on the Catholic side of the question in channels where the Dublin Review would have no chance of reaching; and that, too, without in the least injuring the sale of it. These remarks may, perhaps, prompt the Editor's friends to assist him with their advice, as it certainly is his intention to defend himself against such ungracious, unjust, and uncharitable proceedings.

The Nineteenth Series will contain Lord John Russell's Bill to be presented to the House of Commons on the 7th of February, and the Debates thereon.]

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.—OPENING OF THE SESSION, TUESDAY, FEB. 4, 1851.

The Lord Chancellor, kneeling, presented the Queen with the Royal Speech, and her Majesty read it, as follows, in a most distinct voice, every word being heard in the most distant parts of the house:—

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN:

“It is with great satisfaction that I again meet my Parliament, and resort to your advice and assistance in the consideration of measures which affect the welfare of our country. I continue to maintain the relations of peace and amity with Foreign Powers. It has been my endeavour to induce the States of Germany to carry into full effect the provisions of the treaty with Denmark, which was concluded at Berlin in the month of July of last year. I am much gratified in being able to inform you that the German Confederation and the Government of Denmark are now engaged in fulfilling the stipulations of that treaty, and thereby putting an end to hostilities which at one time appeared full of danger to the peace of Europe. I trust that the affairs of Germany may be arranged by mutual agreement, in such a manner as to preserve the strength of the Confederation and to maintain the freedom of its separate States. I have concluded with the King of Sardinia articles additional to the treaty of September, 1841, and I have directed that those articles shall be laid before you. The Government of Brazil has taken new, and I hope efficient, measures for the suppression of the atrocious traffic in slaves.

“GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

“I have directed the Estimates of the year to be prepared and laid before you without delay. They have been framed with a due regard to economy, and to the necessities of the Public Service.

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN:

“Notwithstanding the large reductions of taxation which have been effected in late years, the receipts of the Revenue have been satisfactory. The state of the commerce and manufactures of the United Kingdom has been such as to afford general employment to the labouring classes. I have to lament, however, the difficulties which are still felt by that important body among my people who are owners and occupiers of land. But it is my confident hope that the prosperous condition of other classes of my subjects will have a favourable effect in diminishing those difficulties, and promoting the interests of agriculture. The recent assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles conferred by a foreign Power has excited strong feelings in this country, and large bodies of my subjects have presented addresses to me, expressing attachment to the Throne, and praying that such assumptions should be resisted. I have assured them of my resolution to maintain the rights of my Crown, and the independence of the nation, against all encroachment, from whatever quarter it may proceed. I have, at the same time, expressed my earnest desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the Religious Liberty which is so justly prized by the people of this country. It will be for you to consider the measure which will be laid before you on this subject. The administration of justice in the several departments of law and equity will no doubt receive the serious attention of Parliament; and I feel confident that the measures which may be submitted, with a view of improving that administration, will be discussed with that mature deliberation which important changes in the highest courts of judicature in the kingdom imperatively demand. A measure will be laid before you, providing for the establishment of a system of registration of deeds and instruments relating to the transfer of property. This measure is the result of inquiries which I have caused to be made into the practicability of adopting a system of registration calculated to give security to titles, and to diminish the causes of litigation to which they have hitherto been liable, and to reduce the cost of transfers. To combine the progress of improvement with the stability of our institutions will, I am confident, be your constant care. We may esteem ourselves fortunate that we can pursue without disturbance the course of calm and peaceable amelioration; and we have every cause to be thankful to Almighty God for the measure of tranquillity and happiness which has been vouchsafed to us.”

The Earl of EFFINGHAM rose to move that their lordships adopt an Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. One topic to which attention was called in her Majesty's Speech was that which had so completely engrossed the public mind—namely, the late act of the Pope of Rome against the independence of this country. Their lordships, he thought, would not be surprised at the excitement which prevailed out of doors on this subject, and he trusted they would not fail to sympathise in those feelings of indignation manifested by almost all classes of her Majesty's subjects. In alluding to this question, he was anxious, if possible, not to give offence to the sentiments of any man; but, at the same time, he could not consent to conceal his opinion, or hesitate on any occasion to express it openly. Now, all must admit that there has been no such invasion of the rights and independence of this country by the Bishop of Rome since the time of the Reformation. He believed the act against our national independence would not have been submitted to by our Roman Catholic ancestors, and would not have been borne by any Roman Catholic country at the present day, and therefore he thought their lordships would agree with him that we ought not to submit to it now. It must be most gratifying, he was sure, to hear the expression in the Speech from the Throne, that her Majesty was determined, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the rights of the Crown and the independence of the nation against all encroachments, from whatever quarter they may come. He could not but congratulate their lordships on the existence of that sound Protestant feeling exhibited by this country on this occasion, showing, he thought, beyond all doubt, that the heart of the country was sound, and that it had no sympathy with Rome. The attempt of the Pope to interfere with our internal and domestic concerns must, he thought, be met by a legislative enactment; but what that measure might be it was not for them to consider now; and he would only express a hope that it would be such as would satisfy their lordships themselves, meet the just expectations of the country, and be adequate to effect the object for which it was intended. He trusted that they would continue to have full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and that Roman Catholics would still possess full toleration, so long as they did not encroach on the rights of others. But in establishing a hierarchy of their own, subject to a foreign potentate, he thought that they were infringing on the rights of the Crown as well as those of the Established Church. He would afford to the Roman Catholics every facility for developing their religion; but if they could not do that without instituting a hierarchy with English territorial designations, then he was prepared to say that measures should be taken to prevent them from infringing on our religious and civil liberties. It had been said that this appointment of a hierarchy was intended to be preparatory to the introduction of the canon law, but that law could not be introduced consistently with the supremacy of our own law. The Pope, by making these appointments, had assumed in this country a power which was incompatible with the maintenance of the supremacy of our own Sovereign. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would meet this aggression, and would introduce a measure for that purpose. But still they must not delude themselves with the belief that the great evil might be met by legislative measures merely.

Lord CREMORNE said he rose with much difficulty to second the Address to her Majesty, which had been proposed by the noble earl. The important subject which had for some time past been agitating the public mind—he meant the late proceeding of the Papal see—naturally attracted the largest share of attention. The noble earl had already alluded to this subject, and he (Lord Cremorne) need hardly say how entirely he concurred with him in the sentiments he had expressed. He felt much gratification at the circumstance of her Majesty recommending this question to the attention of the House, and he sincerely trusted that their lordships would be prepared to concur with her Majesty's Government in imposing restrictions on the Papal power in this country. It was also most satisfactory to find this recommendation in her Majesty's Speech, coupled with an assurance, from which they might infer that, whatever measures might be proposed, they would in no way interfere with the civil and religious liberty of her Majesty's subjects; that these measures would not be those of persecution against Roman Catholic subjects, but would only be calculated to resist oppression on the part of the Court of Rome. He thought he might say that most of the Roman Catholic peers and members of the other House of Parliament would approve of this policy, and that they, in common with their ancestors, would think it necessary to maintain the supremacy of the Crown and Church by Acts of Parliament against the spirit of oppression which had always animated, and still did animate, the Court of Rome.

Lord STANLEY then rose, and spoke as follows:—My lords, I come to a topic of a most serious nature, which I am anxious to handle in the manner recommended by the advice and example of the noble mover of the Address. It is impossible not to feel that by recent measures—I do not say by a recent measure, but by recent measures—of the head of the Roman Catholic Church there has been an aggression most dangerous and unconstitutional. I will not say insidious, but I will say an insolent aggression upon the supremacy of the Crown of England, rendered more insolent and more offensive by the manner in which it has been carried into effect. It is impossible to condemn the proceedings which have taken place in stronger terms than those by which they have been characterised by the noble lord who holds the responsible situation of principal adviser of the Crown. The noble lord, in a letter which has attained great celebrity, which has produced no small effect on the public mind, says,—“There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England, and a claim to sole and undivided sway which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation, as asserted even in Roman Catholic times.” When the noble lord penned that sentence, when he sent it forth as the deliberate opinion of the head of the Government, when he announced to the people of this country that the Queen's supremacy had been insulted, that the religious independence of the country was threatened, that the rights of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church were invaded, he could not have written, still less have published, that sentence without being aware of the nature of the flame which was about to be kindled. He must have realised to himself the extent and amount of that genuine, spontaneous, firm, Protestant feeling, which has burst forth from one end of the country to the other; and although occasionally in language the intemperance of which I cannot justify, yet not for the most part in terms of hostility against the persons or even the religion of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, but against an assumption of authority and power on the part of a foreign prelate—potentate, under existing circumstances, I can hardly call him—(a laugh)—which has been denounced in the strongest terms by the Prime Minister of the Crown. But when the noble lord made that appeal to the feelings of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, when he called forth that expression of Protestant feeling from all parts of the kingdom, when he obtained for himself a popularity which the profession of sincere Protestant and religious feeling, and the maintenance

of the honour and authority of the Crown will always obtain in this country, I think the noble lord could hardly have taken that step without having deliberately calculated the cost and considered the magnitude of the struggle in which he was about to engage. We are not now entering upon the question as to the adoption of this or that act; we are not dealing with a single act, but with a succession of acts of aggression on the part of the Pope of Rome which the noble lord has characterised in the strongest terms. We are protesting against the insolent interference of a foreign power in the domestic affairs of this country. I trust that neither in this nor the other House of Parliament will it be treated as a question of the comparative purity or corruption of the doctrines of the reformed or the Roman Catholic Church. With that we have nothing to do. God forbid that I should desire, on account of their religion, to deprive my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen of the full, perfect, and entire exercise of their religious freedom, or restrict them in the enjoyment of any civil right which has been conferred upon them. If that be what is demanded by the Protestantism of the country, I cannot share the triumph or partake the gale; for these are not my views, these are not the feelings with which I approach the question. The question is this—shall the Roman Catholic prelates, shall the head of this Roman Catholic Church, be permitted to exercise in this country, uncontrolled and unchecked, a mischievous and dangerous interference, not with names and titles, not with shadows and ideas, but with substantial realities, in the government of the country? That is the question you have to ask—that is the struggle on which you are about to enter. If the letter of the noble lord means anything, it means this: “I will vindicate the supremacy of the Crown—I will vindicate the rights of the bishops and clergy—I will vindicate the undivided sway of her Majesty and the Parliament over the domestic concerns of this country, and I will not permit any foreign power or authority to interfere with the administration of this country and the authority of the Queen and the Parliament.” I can understand the feeling which since 1829 has led successive Governments to shut their eyes to matters which they flattered themselves were insignificant. I may regret now that the evil has not been checked at the outset; for I find that every act of concession and toleration, and every manifestation of reluctance to enforce the law when any violation of it has taken place, has been looked upon as indications of weakness; and growing by impunity, growing by continual success, these encroachments have become greater and more formidable, more determined and more resolute, until at last they have reached a pitch at which the Prime Minister of the Crown declares in the most solemn manner that to tolerate them is inconsistent with the supremacy of the Crown and the religious and political interests of the country. Don't let us underrate the magnitude of the struggle on which, if you mean anything, you are about to enter. If you mean nothing—if you mean to introduce some measure, to put some new enactment on the statute-book, which is to be evaded or not enforced—if you disallow the title of Bishop of Nottingham, but enable the Bishop of Nottingham and other bishops to complete their synodical organisation, and, through that means, to exercise boundless control over the consciences of their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects—I tell you you have done nothing towards meeting the emergency; I tell you that you will make your Roman Catholic subjects the victims of a tyranny which their Roman Catholic ancestors in Roman Catholic times, and under a Roman Catholic sovereign, would never have submitted to. I do not altogether agree in the conclusions of my noble friend on the cross benches (Earl of St. Germans). I say that which you do with regard to England you must do with regard to Ireland—that which is a violation of the supremacy of the Crown in England is an equal violation, and to the same extent, of the supremacy of the Crown in Ireland. You cannot separate the Church which, once for all, was indissolubly united at the period of the Union. Don't shut your eyes to the gravity of the occasion. If you mean to palter with this question, after having roused the feelings, the expectations, the religious—I will not call them prejudices—but the strong religious feeling of the Protestants of England, of Scotland, and of Ireland, you finish by a most “lame and impotent conclusion.” Affecting to touch the shadow, but not dealing with the substance of the injuries of which you complain, you will rekindle that religious animosity, the kindling of which, under any circumstances, I should deeply deplore, instead of coming to a satisfactory determination of the question by the intervention of Parliament. I have already said that, for one, I will not consent to deprive my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen of one jot or tittle of those civil rights which were conferred upon them by the act of 1829. I know not what may be the measure which we shall be invited to consider on the part of her Majesty's Government. Whatever it may be, we cannot but expect to find the realisation of those expectations which the Prime Minister has excited. We will hope to find in it a law by which the free exercise of Roman Catholic worship, by which the full performance, the full possession, of civil rights on the part of the Roman Catholics may be reconciled with the clear and substantial vindication of the supremacy of the Crown, and not in words but in actions, a practical repudiation of foreign interference by prelate or by cardinal, which shall render it impossible for the Roman Catholic hierarchy to impede—as I fear, in the case of the Irish colleges, there is some danger they may impede—a measure desired and claimed as highly beneficial by a large portion of the Roman Catholics themselves, and by one-half the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland. I say, I trust, with the maintenance of entire religious liberty, with the maintenance of the full civil rights of the Roman Catholics, the measure which you introduce will prevent the dangerous and mischievous and successful intermeddling of a foreign prelate who, as we are told, has been deceived by false representations relative to the affairs of Ireland by interested parties; and that we shall maintain for the Crown and Parliament of England the entire administration of our own internal affairs, whether ecclesiastical or civil. We shall look with great anxiety for the measure to be submitted to Parliament by her Majesty's Government. I warn them that if it falls short of our just expectations—I warn them that if, in appearance only and not in substance, it provides a security against those wrongs and insults of which the Prime Minister complains in such forcible terms—then will rest upon the heads of the Government a heavy responsibility, for having trifled with the feelings—with the strongest and holiest feelings of the people of this country—for having unfairly roused the hopes and expectations of Protestants, and I believe, if they would speak out, of a large portion of the more enlightened and liberal Roman Catholics. They will have reduced this country, or at least its Roman Catholic inhabitants, and, to a great extent, the deliberation of Parliament itself, to a state of submission to which Roman Catholic parliaments never submitted. I do not hesitate to say that you ought now to consider fully and deliberately, dispassionately, temperately, but at the same time firmly, the whole of the difficult question of the relation in which the Roman Catholic subjects of this country stand to the Crown. In the year 1829 certain securities were introduced, which it was supposed would be effectual securities to the Protestant Church. I think it the duty of the Government deliberately to examine those securities. If they are offensive, as they may be, to Roman Catholics, and give no real security and no real protection to the interests of Protestantism—if they

are incapable of being enforced—if they encumber the statute-book as a dead letter—sweep them off, and do not leave yourselves the odium of enacting them without gaining the advantage to be derived from enforcing them. But if there be cases in which the securities intended to be effectual have proved, from whatever cause, incapable of being applied—if the law does not touch the cases which it was intended to touch—if encroachments not then contemplated have been committed on our liberties by the see of Rome and the prelates either in England or Ireland—I say it is no violation of liberty, civil or religious, that you should make those securities what they were intended to be. You must look at the whole matter in the case calmly and dispassionately. You must not content yourselves with trifling legislation, but to the extent to which the danger exists, to that extent you must boldly and unflinchingly apply a remedy. If that be the course pursued by the Government, no feeling of political difference, no feeling of party, shall preclude them from obtaining the assistance of that great body with which I have the honour to act. We do not desire to deprive them of the great popularity which they will obtain by enforcing the rights of the Crown, and the independence of the Church of these realms, without injury to the civil rights of those who dissent from that Church. But on the other hand, I warn them, if they do not deal boldly with the whole case, far better would it be that they should not attempt to legislate at all—far better still would it have been had they submitted even to this last and greatest encroachment which we have sustained from Rome. Deal manfully and boldly with the question, or deal with it not at all. Don't assume to control a power by merely ignoring its existence or imposing an irrecoverable penalty upon its evasion or violation. Deal with it boldly. You will have the assent and support of your political opponents and the country at large. Flinch from it, seek to mitigate and palliate, but not to remedy, and you will incur the contempt of the country at large, and will prove your own incompetence to deal with evils the magnitude of which you do not hesitate to denounce. I wait with deep anxiety the measure which her Majesty's Government intend to submit to the consideration of Parliament, and I earnestly hope that the question may be dealt with in a manner suitable to the emergency of the case.

The Duke of RICHMOND and the Earl of WINCHILSEA having each made a few observations, Lord CAMOYS said he was, as their lordships were aware, a Roman Catholic. His family had been so for many generations, and he took a pride in confessing that their opinions were in him unchanged; but at the same time he was an Englishman, and the rights and liberty and integrity of this country were as dear to him as they were to any member of that house. He acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the Queen over the Established Church to the fullest extent that the most orthodox Protestant could desire; and he acknowledged, at the same time, the supremacy of the Pope over the Catholics. Against the exercise of the Pope's temporal power in this country it was, however, his duty to protest. He could also go further, and say, that against the exercise of undue or unnecessary spiritual power by the Pope in this country it was his duty to protest. He had watched the struggle for Catholic emancipation with the deepest interest, and no one more rejoiced than himself at the triumph of the great principle of civil and religious liberty. He would not stop to inquire, as some persons—perhaps with bad taste—had done, whether that act was the result of fear, hatred, or affection; but he said that the act was liberally asked, and the nation acquiesced in its enactment. There was no written or expressed compact made at that time between the Protestants and the Catholics. But there was this moral compact made: the Protestant did, in effect, say to the Catholic, "You shall be admitted into all the rights and privileges of the British Constitution, you shall enjoy with us all the advantages of civil and religious liberty, but you must not trespass on our ground." The Catholic, on the other hand, in effect said this: "I agree to that arrangement, and I am ready to take an oath to that effect." He (Lord Camoys) said that compact had not been violated. What should have been the policy and the duty of the Roman Catholics since the emancipation? It was this: to show, by their conduct, that those who had supported them should never have any reason to repent of the service they had rendered them; that their opponents should have no ground for supposing that they had any justification for the feelings which they entertained towards the Roman Catholics. He had said that he thought the moral compact to which he alluded had not been violated. He hoped the conduct of the Roman Catholics had not made any of their friends repent the services they had rendered to them; but he had reason to fear that the conduct of some of the Roman Catholics, especially amongst the clergy, had had the effect of making some of their opponents more firm in the opposition which they had originated. He was anxious to take a fair and impartial view of the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, approving of that which he thought right, and at the same time expressing condemnation where he felt it to be necessary. First of all, then, let us look at the policy of this introduction, as regards the Roman Catholics. They were upon the best terms with their Protestant friends—a liberal spirit of toleration was exercised towards them. A Catholic, like a Protestant, could confidently appeal to the authorities for an impartial administration of justice. They were increasing in numbers, and, though not largely, in wealth. They were building new churches and temples, and beautiful ones too, in various parts of the country. Numbers were joining their communion from the opposite ranks. Even from high ranks they were joining them; clergymen of the Established Church were also joining the Roman Catholic Church, the result of conversions not effected through the persuasions of the priests, but their own studies. They examined into the question between the two divisions, and decided—rightly or wrongly he should not inquire—to secede from the one to the other. The number thus joining the Roman Catholic body, and increasing their strength, was giving great stability to that body. Now, when this state of things was going on, it was the worst possible policy, it was a culpable error, to introduce into this country the Roman Catholic hierarchy. He believed it was to the great ignorance at Rome of the religious condition of this country that we were indebted for that hierarchy. Noble lords who had been at Rome, or who had conversed with people who had been there, must know the extremely extravagant ideas which were entertained there of the religious condition of this country. It was there supposed that, because a few clergymen of the Established Church had joined the Roman Catholic communion, half of England was ready to be converted. They forgot this most important circumstance, that whereas many clergymen did join the Roman Catholic communion, in no one instance did their congregations follow them. It had been said that the Puseyites were a great cause of the Papal aggression. If by that it was meant that the Puseyites directly interfered, he (Lord Camoys) was prepared to deny it. It might, however, be attributed to them indirectly. He would, however, say nothing more upon that point, as he felt that he should best consult his own feelings by refraining from any further allusion to that party. He would make one other observation. He did not so much blame the Papal Government for the ignorance which they had displayed in this matter as those Englishmen who were naturally the advisers of the Roman Government. They ought to have recollected that that was

a Protestant country, that the constitution was a Protestant constitution, and that the people were Protestant, with the exception of the portion of them that professed the Roman Catholic faith. He would not enter into the question of whether the Roman Catholics had a right to have bishops and archbishops, but he would at once go to the question of whether they had violated any law in establishing a Roman Catholic hierarchy in the country. There were two statutes which had particular reference to the subject—the 1st and 13th of Elizabeth, and especially the 24th section of the latter act. The 1st of Elizabeth had been repealed, as far as regarded the pains and penalties imposed by that act; and he contended that when they granted toleration to those of his persuasion by the Act of Catholic Emancipation, it was virtually permitting them to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters. The provisions of the 1st and 13th of Elizabeth were repealed by the provisions of the subsequent Act of Parliament which was contradictory of them. The Roman Catholics had not violated the law, and in support of that opinion he would quote a very high authority—he alluded to Lord Lyndhurst, who, when the 9th and 10th of Victoria was under consideration in that House, said that a Roman Catholic did not violate the law in acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope, if he did not do so for an improper purpose, in which case he was certainly liable to punishment by the common law of the land; but if he acknowledged his supremacy in spiritual matters only, then he had a perfect right to do so. Upon that occasion a right reverend prelate, the Bishop of Exeter, asked the noble and learned lord emphatically, if it was not an offence at common law to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters; and he repeated that it was not, unless that supremacy was acknowledged from an improper motive or purpose; and he said that he had no doubt that such would be the opinion entertained by the judges. He mentioned that to show how mistaken was the opinion of an eminent personage who had recently expressed a contrary opinion at a recent public meeting. If the Roman Catholic Relief Act was an act of toleration, then that toleration necessarily involved the repeal of the act of Elizabeth, and allowed the Roman Catholics to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. In the Emancipation Act, it was true, there was a clause which, after describing that there should be toleration extended to the Roman Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland, made an express exception in the case of Scotland with respect to the assumption of titles. The Crown was the fountain of honour, and it alone was capable of conferring authority on persons assuming dignities in that country; and therefore, although the Pope might confer titles, he could not invest them with authority. If he were to confer the title of Cardinal on any person, that person would have just as much authority in consequence as Cardinal Wiseman had. If Cardinal Wiseman, or any other Roman Catholic, assumed a title possessed by any of the bishops of the Church of England, he would, no doubt, be liable to a penalty of 100*l.* for doing so; but until they infringed the law by doing so, they were not liable to pains and penalties of any kind. In the recent appointments, therefore, they had kept within the law. Under these circumstances, he could not help expressing his disapprobation of the letter of Lord John Russell. Like every other Roman Catholic in the country, and he believed in the world, he could not help feeling that he was insulted by that letter. He did not, however, look on that letter as the letter of Lord John Russell in his capacity of a Cabinet Minister, but as that of an individual; and he was confirmed in that view, because it did not appear that the noble lord intended to act upon it. He regretted, however, that their religion should be characterised as “munimery.” Roman Catholics were found in all classes in the country; they were to be found in places of trust and emolument; they were to be found in that House, and sitting near the bench of bishops and in the councils of the Sovereign; and it was not right, therefore, that their religion should be characterised by such a term. They were, it was true, in the minority in England and Scotland, but they were a preponderating majority in Ireland, and they formed one-third of the entire population of the three kingdoms. In France, Italy, Spain, and other countries, they formed the vast majority of the people; and with these facts before him, the Prime Minister could not, he thought, intend to throw upon them, as a Cabinet Minister, a gratuitous insult; but, although he acquitted him of the intention to do so, the letter was not, on that account, to be justified. He regretted that Cardinal Wiseman had not acted with due discretion. Before he assumed his title he ought to have had an interview with Lord John Russell, and it was an act of duty and courtesy that he should have called upon him and told him what was about to be done; and not having done so, the Prime Minister might be annoyed at that breach of duty. In that respect it mattered not why the Cardinal assumed a foreign title in this country; but it was material that he should not have taken the step he did without consulting with Lord John Russell. Notwithstanding the violence of some of the language which was used at many of the public meetings which had taken place against what was called the Papal aggression, he felt bound in justice to say that generally a liberal spirit appeared to prevail at them.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE said that it appeared to him that if the debate had come to a conclusion without the House hearing the noble lord behind him, who had just sat down, and who had addressed them with such temper and candour, it would have been prematurely and unsatisfactorily closed. He had listened with great attention to the speech of the noble lord, the more so as it came from one whose ancestors were so long connected with the Roman Catholics of England. He thought the sentiments which he had uttered ought to outweigh a thousand speeches uttered by those whose ignorance was their only claim on public attention. He hoped the time would never come when the House did anything that infringed on complete toleration to all sects. The Earl of Winchelsea said that he did not think it was at all necessary, in order to grant toleration, that the measure of Catholic Emancipation should have been passed. But could it be considered toleration while any of their fellow-subjects were labouring under civil disabilities? He could not consider toleration complete until civil privileges were extended to all classes of their fellow-subjects; and he, for one, was not of opinion that they should retrace their steps, or resort to a system such as was suggested by the noble earl, and which he must call persecution. Even if Catholic Emancipation had never taken place, they were as much liable to the aggression on the part of the Pope which had caused so much excitement throughout the country, as they were after the passing of that measure. The same facilities would have existed for that aggression, without their being in the same position to justify the people of this country for the indignation they had exhibited. The act of the Pope had been characterised, and ought to be characterised, as an act of usurpation. The apologists of the Pope said, that when he appointed Cardinal Wiseman, he only gave him spiritual dominion over the Roman Catholic population of this country; but why did he not, in his letter, state that distinctly, instead of giving him generally dominion over the whole population, and set aside thereby the rights of the Crown and the institutions of the country? It must be remembered that the authority proceeded from a power which claimed universal dominion, and held doctrines inconsistent with the supremacy of the Crown and the liberty of thought.

In the hope that their lordships would give their best attention to the measure which it was the intention of the Government to introduce, when it came before them, he would not further address them on the subject. All that he would then say was, that he considered the act of the Pope an act of usurpation in the United Kingdom.

The Earl of **RODEX**, who was very indistinctly heard in the gallery, expressed his dissatisfaction with the allusion which had been made in the Speech from the Throne to the late aggression of the Pope of Rome, and attributed the aggression in a great measure to the encouragement which had been given to Popery, by giving Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland precedence over barons of that House. He disagreed with Lord Camoys as to the state of the law with reference to the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops in England, but gave that noble lord credit for the candid and straightforward manner in which he had expressed himself on the question.

The Address was then agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE SPEECH.

The Marquess of **KILDARE**, in rising to move that an humble address be presented to her Majesty, in reply to the gracious Speech that she had made that day from the Throne, said, the principal topic was a painful one: it was that of a most wanton and unjustifiable aggression on the part of a foreign power against this State. It would be the duty of that House, whilst they preserved that religious liberty which had been extended to all classes of her Majesty's subjects, to consider the measures that would be laid before them to maintain her Majesty's supremacy and the religious independence of the country. The noble marquess concluded by moving the Address, which was, as usual, an echo to the Speech.

Mr. **PETO** rose and said: Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty in her gracious Speech refers to the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles, and to a bill to be hereafter laid on the table of the House, and on this part I trust that the wording of the Address will commend itself to all. No honourable member, by giving his assent to this Address, is bound to any subsequent course of action, nor can I think that honourable members professing the Roman Catholic faith are by it committed to any course of proceedings until the bill to which it refers is laid on the table of this House. Her Majesty refers to a fact patent to all, and while we all feel bound by every tie to protect the civil and religious liberty of the subject to the utmost, we are all equally bound by our devoted loyalty and love to our Sovereign to protect her prerogative from aggression of every kind also, and that to the utmost. We are not called on, sir, to any reactionary course. The antecedents of the First Minister of the Crown are a pledge more than sufficient to the most timid mind, that, while he will constitutionally preserve every right of the Crown and her Majesty's civil supremacy, and while he will oppose determinedly the introduction of a code of laws alike opposed to the rights of the Queen and the civil liberty of the subject, he will not sully his fair reputation by any course which shall be inconsistent with that love of true religious liberty which he has ever shown. And here, sir, I must ask permission of the House to read a short extract from a speech of that noble lord in introducing the repeal of the Test Act in 1828—that noble lord being then in opposition:—"I now come to the great principle involved in the numerous petitions before the House, petitions signed by the whole body of Dissenters, by Roman Catholics, and by many members of the Established Church. That principle is, that every man ought to be allowed to form his religious opinions by the impressions on his own mind, and that when so formed, he should be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, without being subjected to any penalty or disqualification whatever—hat every restraint or restriction imposed on any man on account of his religious creed is in the nature of persecution, and is at once an offence to God and an injury to man. This is the first and noble principle on which the Dissenters claim the repeal of the test laws. But I will fairly admit that there may be an exception to its application, and I will illustrate it by reference to the general principle of non-interference by one State in the internal affairs of another. It may be stated that one State would not generally be justified in interfering in the internal concerns of another; but if some of the internal regulations of political institutions of one State are of such a nature as to lead directly to the injury of another, then the interference properly commences on the part of the State making such regulations, and not on the part of the State which complains of them. I will say the same of religion. If the religion of any body of men be found to contain political principles hostile to the State, or militating against that allegiance which is due from every subject of the Crown, in that case the question ceases to be a religious question, and you have a right to interfere and impose such restrictions as you may deem necessary, because you do not impose them on religious opinions, you impose them only on political doctrines." Having read this extract, I trust we shall all feel we may reserve ourselves with perfect confidence till we see the bill introduced; but if it be doubted as to the propriety of any bill at all being brought in, I point to Roman Catholic peers of the highest standing who have publicly declared that allegiance to the canon law is incompatible with allegiance to the Sovereign. If so, we see good reason for the introduction of some measure for our consideration; not, sir, that those noble lords are recreant to their religious principles in thus resenting the Papal rescript; not that, through the indirect influences of Protestantism, they have adopted views which in other times they would have abhorred. Nothing like it; the Papal rescript would have been resented in the palmiest days of the Roman Catholic religion in this country. Why, sir, our earliest national history is full of incidents in which the people, the Parliament, and the barons of England—Catholics as they all were—indignantly declaimed against such intrusions on the part of the Roman Pontiff. The canon law, for example, has always been hateful to Englishmen, and I do trust that in the measures to be taken its operation in this country will be rendered null and void, otherwise we shall be embroiled in interminable intestine disputes utterly incompatible with the safety, the honour, and the welfare of our Sovereign and her dominions. I trust all honourable members will feel they can concur in the terms of the Address, and I hope we shall postpone any debate on a subject so exciting until the matter is substantively before us. The hon. member concluded by seconding the adoption of the Address.

Mr. **ROEBUCK**—Sir, I never, since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, have risen with so much pain as on the present occasion; and when I say this, it is not the mere phrase of common-place speaking. It is a true representation of the state of my mind that I am giving to the House, when I say I never felt pain equal to that which I now feel in rising to address you. And the reason of this pain is, that now, for the first time since I have had a seat in this House, I find an administration calling itself a Liberal Administration, headed by one who has gained his whole honour and distinction by being one of a great Liberal party, heading the first step backward, and amongst a nation and in a time at which onward

progress is the distinctive mark by which we seek, on all occasions and on every occasion, to say we are honoured, in that nation and at that time, and by that Administration, and by that Prime Minister, the first real backward step is attempted to be taken. On looking, says the honourable gentleman, to the antecedents of the noble lord at the head of the Government, are they not in themselves a guarantee for his conduct? There was a time that I should have said so, but not now. Last year I would have spoken as the honourable member has done; I would have said that the antecedents of the noble lord would be a sure guarantee that it would be impossible that in him we should find the first real opponent of civil and religious liberty since the year 1829. What are the antecedents of the noble lord? He was distinguished amongst us as being chosen by his party to be the organ in this House to bring forward the bill for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. That was his special business—it was the first step taken in civil and religious liberty, and he was the person chosen to bring it forward in this House; and on that occasion I heard it remarked—and I beg to call the consideration of the honourable gentleman who seconded the address to the fact—that the real objection to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was, that by relieving the Dissenters from disabilities, and by relieving Protestants from the yoke that Protestants had put upon them, they would enable them to keep the yoke upon the backs of the Catholics. That was the observation of one who knew well the human mind; that was the observation made by Mr. Canning. Mr. Canning said, “Beware of what you are doing; mind what you are doing. So soon as you relieve the Dissenters of this country from the disabilities they labour under, you will find in them your bitterest foes when you propose to remove the disabilities of the Roman Catholics.” I find in the honourable member an apt illustration of that. We have no longer disabilities on the Protestants; we have a united Protestant country conjoined; and then it is proposed to place disabilities upon Roman Catholics. But I was remarking upon the conduct of the noble lord; and when, I ask, is it that the noble lord has chosen to take this step backward? At a time when her Ministers have put into the mouth of the Sovereign a statement with respect to the advance that has taken place in the country, and the happiness that prevails among the labouring classes in consequence of the laws that have been passed removing the restrictions on labour, trade, and industry, and the advantages that have been experienced from so doing. He puts into the mouth of the Sovereign words of gratulation, and he calls on the House of Commons to join in the thanks he pays to Providence for the happiness we now enjoy. Since 1829 we have been going onward in one peculiar line of legislation. On that occasion the great Protestant leader, whose death we all deplore, and whose loss we this day feel, yielded to experience—yielded to the pressure of circumstances in Ireland; and the Duke of Wellington, who had seen more years of war than almost any man of his time, and most of those years of civil war, knowing what the mischiefs of civil war are, said, “To relieve my country from one month of it, I would give up my life at once.” Under that pressure Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington acted. Then the question was, civil war or emancipation; and those men, those great men, taking up the principle, acted upon it frankly; and Sir Robert Peel directly stated, when it was suggested to him to pay the Catholic clergy, that he had considered the question, and it was one worthy of all consideration, but that he could not hold it out, though it was the proposal of Mr. Pitt, sanctioned by Lord Castlereagh, and that he would not interfere in the internal polity of the Catholic religion any more than he would interfere with the Wesleyans. The noble lord and the party to which he belonged felt great pain, and I will use the word, great jealousy, that these, the enemies of all liberty—the enemies of the emancipation of the Catholics—should come at that time and sweep away the honour for which they had been so long contending; and it was the complaint of the party to which the noble lord belonged, and of the noble lord himself, that they had been obliged to fight the battle of emancipation through all its difficulties and trials in this House, and that the honour of carrying emancipation was gathered by another party. The assent of the party to which the noble lord belonged was given to the measure on that occasion; the thanks and gratulations of all the members of that party were given for it; and they showed that they did assent to the principle then laid down, and that if the Government had not given that measure they would have persevered in their demand for emancipation. They said their wishes were gratified, and they were delighted to see that the Catholics were now on the same footing as their Protestant brethren—that they were not in any way to have political disabilities imposed upon them, in consequence of their religious belief. Now, sir, when such is the state of this country—when such is the onward progress of opinion, what does the noble lord propose to do? He tells us (the Queen’s Speech being the noble lord’s speech) that she has received many addresses from large bodies of her subjects with respect to the ecclesiastical titles conferred by a foreign power, and the noble lord does not leave us in doubt as to his intentions on the subject, for this evening notice has been given that the noble lord will bring in a bill to prevent the enjoyment or assumption of any ecclesiastical title or honour that may be conferred by any foreign Sovereign or Prince in respect of places in the United Kingdom. That is to say, that he will tear to pieces the religious distinctions that have been granted by the bishop who is called the Pope of Rome. If the noble lord means to say that there happens to be a weak Sovereign on the banks of the Tiber, who has chosen to give certain names and titles to persons in this country, if that be what the noble lord means, it is a fair course for him to pursue, and it would be an object against which to direct his attacks, but that is not the case. The noble lord has always shown himself to be, and I believe him to be, a frank dealing man; and I ask him, is it not against the Bishop of Rome his act is directed? Who is the Bishop of Rome? He is a Sovereign Prince as well as Bishop of Rome. He might cease to be Prince of Rome to-morrow, but he would still be the Bishop of Rome, the head of the Roman Catholic religion, from whom they derive their spiritual power, and the very essence of the Catholic religion; and to say to the Catholics, that they shall not have bishops, who derive their power from the Pope of Rome, is to say to them—You shall not have bishops to confer on you the spiritual comforts of your religion. In other words, it is gross persecution. But I am to be met with the words—aggression on her Majesty’s prerogative, Papal aggression, territorial aggression. There is a phrase that has been introduced by our American friends, it is called the table of political capital. It is an admirable speculation, with no capital at all, for the gaining of some; and I think the noble lord is obtaining political capital on the faith of this proposition. They speak of territorial aggression. Now sir, I charge the noble lord (and I always looked to him to deal frankly) with dealing falsely on the present occasion with the people of this country. This Papal aggression of which he now complains is no new thing. He was aware of it, and must have been aware of it for years. I will prove to your satisfaction, no matter how prejudiced you may be on other matters, that this Papal aggression began years ago, and has been sanctioned by the noble lord himself. England, the noble lord says, has been parcelled out by a foreign power—by the Pope of

Rome; but when? The other day, when this bill was introduced and a cardinal created, and Dr. Wiseman declared to be an archbishop. But was this the first territorial aggression or the first partition of England? Ever since I have known England I have known Catholic bishops to be there. Take, for instance, Bishop Baines, he was called Bishop of Siga; he had a district that included the west of England, and was really, Bishop of Bath. I therefore happened to know something about him. Now he derived his power directly from the Pope. He was a bishop consecrated by the Pope. The peculiar powers of a bishop he exercised directly from the Pope. He was also vicar apostolic. Now what does that mean? It will appear that so far from the Pope having lately acquired power, he has divested himself of power; and that so far from this being an aggression, it is a retrogression. And that so far from encroaching on the prerogatives of her Majesty, he has given, as regards ecclesiastical matters, the Catholic people of England the power of governing themselves. Before this change was made the Catholic bishop in England was like a legate *a latere*—the Pope was the only Bishop of England, the Pope was the person who created the bishop, and to whom everything was referred, and, through his vicars apostolic, governed this country entirely in religious matters so far as the Catholics were concerned. Then it was said, We will make a hierarchy, and the bishops will be elected by persons in England. (An Hon. Member—No, no.) I say yes; the honourable gentleman will find himself mistaken; the bishops will be elected by persons in England, subject certainly to the approbation of the Pope; but the vicars apostolic were not appointed by any persons in England. They were appointed by the Pope, they were under his control, they were his servants—his slaves, I may say—and the power of the Pope was supreme. But oh, it is said, there is much more in it than that. He is called Archbishop of Westminster. I believe Dr. Baines was called Bishop of Siga *in partibus infidelium*; but suppose he was called Bishop of Bath and Wells, what difference would it make, or where would be the aggression on her Majesty's prerogative? To have such an assertion made by the greatest men amongst us, so far as power is concerned, is preposterous. Can it tend to violate her Majesty's prerogative that Dr. Wiseman should be called Archbishop of Westminster instead of being called Bishop of Metopotamus? How is her prerogative attacked by a mere change of words, or what is the meaning of this aggression upon it? I have glanced my eye over column upon column of rubbishy talk upon this subject, and I feel it is one of the greatest privileges of this House that we can have a discussion upon it, and that what we say shall not be lost amidst the noise of roaring sectarians. In this House, however humble the individual, let him speak fairly and honestly, and the House will listen to him; and I am confident, not in myself, but from the simple statement of the truth, that my countrymen, by-and-bye, will be ashamed both of the combustion and the persons who have stirred it up. I want to know what is the meaning of this word aggression. Has the law been changed? Not at all. I want to deal with this matter gravely, and I ask where is the aggression upon her Majesty's prerogative because Dr. Wiseman chooses to call himself cardinal, or because some person else chooses to call him cardinal, and he dresses himself in a large hat, and puts on red stockings, and calls himself Archbishop of Westminster? I don't want to treat this in a ludicrous manner, but I cannot discuss it without doing so. Am I less loyal to her Majesty because I say this? Does anybody believe that the Catholics of England (who are amongst the most peaceable and submissive of all classes of her Majesty's subjects, and who are, I will say, too humble), of all persons in the world, should be accused of making inroads upon her Majesty's prerogative, because Dr. Wiseman is called Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster? What is the power obtained by him? I will answer out of the noble lord's own mouth. Some time ago, in the year 1848, the honourable baronet opposite, the member for the University of Oxford, called attention to something like a proposition that had been made to create a hierarchy in the Romish Church. The honourable baronet is the only consistent man amongst us; he was consistent from the beginning: he said you were wrong in 1829; that you ought to have kept the Catholics down; that you had no business to make this advance. When he sees a principle being carried out which the noble lord had a great hand in establishing, he points it out, and says, There, look to the consequences of your acts; this is the legitimate result of what you did in 1829. And what I complain of the noble lord is this, that after all the experience he has had since 1829, he should come down with great authority and say he has learned—what?—that the principle he then established is a wrong one; that he has been in error all his life; and that it was reserved for him to the end of the year 1850 to discover what is true. He has become a partisan, but he is not quite consistent. Even the honourable member for Oxford cannot be entirely consistent, for to be so he should coerce men into a certain belief, and he cannot do that except by eradicating the individual. In a debate with reference to diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome, the noble lord used the following words:—"You must either give certain advantages to the Roman Catholic religion, and obtain from the Pope certain other advantages in return, among which you must stipulate that the Pope shall not create any dioceses in England without the consent of the Queen; or, on the other hand, you must say that you will have nothing to do with arrangements of that kind—that you will not consent, in any way, to give any authority to the Roman Catholic religion in England. But then you must leave the spiritual authority of the Pope entirely unfettered. You cannot bind the Pope's spiritual influence unless you have some agreement. For my own part, I am not disposed to think that it would be for the advantage of this country, or that it would be agreeable to the Roman Catholics, that we should have an agreement with the Pope, by which their religious arrangements should be regulated. But although you may prevent any spiritual authority from being exercised by the Pope by law, yet there is no provision, no law, my honourable friend could frame, that would deprive the Pope of the influence which is merely exercised over the mind." That was a wise declaration. It was a statement that you could not coerce the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction; that was a statement that although you might anathematise the whole Papal people, and fill the statute-book with pains and penalties against them, you could not exercise any control over the minds of the Catholics. If any person had come to this House and asked the noble lord to bring in a bill to acknowledge Cardinal Wiseman, and give to him a certain pre-eminence and precedence, I could then understand the noble lord's answer to be—I will not consent to this aggression on the prerogatives of the Sovereign; but when it comes to this, that a poor powerless priest comes here, without a single influence but spiritual influence, with no power but the power of mind over mind, not surrounded by guards, not brought here by force of arms, but a simple priest addressing himself to men's minds, and addressing himself to their belief and to their opinions of what is right, there is no coercion, there is no assault upon anybody, there is merely the exercise of mind, in which consists religious liberty, and any manacle you impose upon it is a gross persecution. There is no meaning, therefore, in this word aggression; the contest is wholly one as to the spiritual influence of the Pope. There is no person less subject to that spiritual influence than the person who now addresses you. It appears to me one of those strange

mysterious phenomena by which the human mind is bound, and for which there is no explanation, that there should be a body of men now found to hold the opinions that are held by many on the subject; but I would treat alike the Catholic who bows to the Pope, and the Methodist who bows to the Conference, and the Episcopalian, who does not bow to anybody, but bows to this House. Eventually this House governs the kingdom; the Queen's supremacy is merely the supremacy of the Minister, that means the opinion of this House; and, therefore, if there be any person that the Episcopalian bows to, it is to this House, in matters spiritual as well as temporal. I am of that creed, and believe I shall continue to be so, but I do not arrogate to myself the right that I alone am to judge of the truth. I don't arrogate to myself the right to enroach upon my fellow-subjects, and I would tell my dissenting brethren that they had better be careful, for they are not yet out of the wood; and they may find if they introduce this principle as respects the Catholics, the whip will be applied to their own backs; and if there be a man who will rejoice at the infliction it will be myself. Then, sir, I have to ask, is there an excuse for the Catholics upon the present occasion? Have they done anything which ought to have subjected them to the insult to which, as a body, and as a religious body, they have been subjected? Has the noble lord up to that time, when he was suddenly enlightened about this matter, been in total darkness with respect to what the Catholics were doing? Was the noble lord wholly ignorant on this question? I have a fancy that the noble lord could hardly be so ignorant upon it. Certain I am that Lord Clarendon was not ignorant upon it, nor was the colleague of the noble lord, the Secretary of State for the colonies, ignorant upon it. Oh, it was said, they call themselves archbishop and bishops, and they have got power from the Pope to do so; but were not the Catholics, I ask you, led to believe that they might do so without giving any offence? Were not the Catholic people led to believe they might do what they have done without giving offence? By the Bequests Act there was a commission appointed, in which, distinctly under her Majesty's letters patent, the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church were acknowledged as such, and from year to year they were known to the administration to be so acknowledged. I hold in my hand the third report of those commissioners, and amongst the statements in that third report is a return of the meetings of the commissioners of charitable donations and bequests in Ireland, since the 12th of May, 1847. I will select one statement of a meeting that took place on the 26th May, and there were present the Right Hon. Judge Keatinge in the chair, and subsequently the Right Hon. the Lord Chief Baron. Then comes his Grace the Lord Primate—now he is a Protestant; then comes his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin—now, mark, he is a Protestant; but next comes his Grace the Lord Archbishop Daniel Murray—not saying of what. (Hear, hear.) And that is the whole of this uproar. But is this the first time that this has been done? It is notorious that they have been constantly addressed by the authorities of this country as the archbishops of particular places—for example, the Archbishop of Armagh, the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, and the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. Her Majesty has been pleased to desire that the following shall be the order of *entree* to the Castle: the Primate shall go first, then the Chancellor, then the Archbishop of Dublin, and then the Roman Catholic Primate. Now the Roman Catholic Primate came before the Catholic bishops and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. Now, there is a Protestant Archbishop, and here we have a man acknowledged as having an especial privilege to be called Archbishop of Dublin in the very teeth of an Act of Parliament passed against this very thing. The Queen, nevertheless, must have done this by the advice of her Ministers. I believe that the right honourable gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, who is necessarily the governor of Ireland, is responsible for that document, and that it was issued out of his office. (Sir George Grey was understood to dissent.) At all events, the right honourable gentleman the Home Secretary is, in fact, the governor of Ireland. However, some Minister must have been answerable for it; and what I want to press on this House is, that the Catholics, seeing such a proceeding solemnly stated in so public a document as that, must, with the most perfect simplicity and candour, have thought it to mean that there was really no objection by anybody to their assuming those titles, always excepting the honourable member for the University of Oxford. I hold in my hand now the "Catholic Directory and Almanac for 1848," in which the name set opposite the London district is "the Most Reverend Nicholas Wiseman, D.D., Archbishop of Westminster and London." I am told that he was not then an archbishop. Why was he not? It was the intention of the Pope at that time to make him one, and it was in anticipation of that that this description of Dr. Wiseman was published in the "Directory." A revolution took place at Rome; the Pope was obliged to leave the country; and at that time it was not thought necessary that everybody should know what the Pope was about to do. But the moment he came back to Rome, the Pope did what he intended to have done before. And when we are talking about violating Acts of Parliament, and infringing the Queen's prerogative, I think it may be as well, on the part of those who thus argue with respect to the Act of Parliament against the Roman Catholics, to recollect that they themselves are rather in danger under that very Act of Parliament of having incurred a *premunire* in sending Lord Minto to Rome; for to say that he was not accredited there would be to play false with the House, and in reply to such an assertion I can only use one short word, but as the rules of parliamentary language forbid the employment of that word, I will, therefore, call it the thing that was not. Then it is said that this is an aggression, because there is a parcelling out of England. Sir Robert Peel, in 1829, laid down the rule that he would no more interfere in the internal relations of Roman Catholics than in those of Wesleyan Methodists. Now, here is the "Catholic Directory," and here is also the "Wesleyan Methodist Directory;" and I open the one at the English Ecclesiastical Registry for the Catholics, and I do the same in the "Wesleyan Methodist Directory." The result is curious. Here I find in the one, "London District—The Most Rev. N. Wiseman, D.D., Archbishop of Westminster;" and in the other, "London District—John Beecham, D.D., President of the Conference." Now this is a parcelling out of the kingdom as much in the one case as the other. For what? For the spiritual jurisdiction of this kingdom; and I might parcel out England, and I might style myself "D.D., or A.S.S.," or a president of the conference, or president of any place. Now I ask seriously whether it is worth while, after all that we have heard as regards the conduct of the Administration with respect to the Catholics, and after all that we have heard of the way in which we have lured them on, whether it is worth our while to run any risk? There are in Ireland 8,000,000 of Catholics—one-third nearly of the whole population of the United Kingdom is of that faith; and at the very time when, by the lapse of years, this spiritual bigotry was disappearing—when we met one another as brethren in this House and in society—at a time when we were becoming a united people in spite of differences in religion—was it worth the while of the noble lord at the head of the Government, so long the advocate of religious as well as civil liberty, to aid a cry which has its source in some of the vilest passions of the people—which was, in fact, the outcry of religious hate, and which took the name

and sanction of her Majesty simply to cover that most detestable feeling? The noble lord, forgetting his position, equally forgetting history, and thinking only of a fleeting popularity, lent the sanction of his great name to cover a great vice. Say what we like, look at it as we will, it is nothing more and nothing less than the old puritanical bigotry of England breaking out in the nineteenth century. It is marvellous that of all people a Whig should have given his sanction to such a cry, and should have sanctioned that cry with so great a name. It is most disheartening to see such mean and petty passions disturbing the onward progress of a British Minister.

Sir R. INGLIS said the honourable and learned member for Sheffield had thrown as much ridicule as was in his nature on the proceeding which had agitated the people of this country for the last three months: but he (Sir R. Inglis) would ask the honourable and learned gentleman whether, if such a proceeding had taken place in any other country in Europe, a similar burst of popular feeling would not have been the natural result, so far as the laws of that country permitted? He (Sir R. Inglis) would assert that there was no country, the greatest or smallest, in Europe, in which such a measure as that which the Pope of Rome had attempted to force on the people of this country would not have met with reprobation. The Pope had treated England as if she had neither Crown nor Church, and as if her inhabitants were infidels. To use the popular phrase of the day, he had ignored the existence of the English Crown. What would the result of such an aggression have been if attempted upon Prussia? He (Sir R. Inglis) considered the famous letter of the 4th of November, of the noble lord at the head of the Government, as the text to the speech of her Majesty; and, although that speech was necessarily more diluted than the text, he did not doubt that the noble author of that letter would be found equal to the language which he had originally used. Dr. Twiss, in a most able work, to which he (Sir R. Inglis) would invite the attention of the honourable and learned member for Sheffield, had shown that there was no State in Europe in which, without the consent of the Sovereign of that country, any attempt had ever been made to partition the dominions of that Sovereign, and to create territorial rank and jurisdiction other than that which the Sovereign for the time being could give or sanction. It was too painfully true that her Majesty's Government had encouraged, to some extent, the Papacy in its present aggression. The honourable and learned member (Mr. Roebuck) had brought forward the conduct of her Majesty's Government with respect to giving place and precedence to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He referred briefly to an act which he did not quote, but which gave a direct recognition to the Church of Rome in the person of the Archbishop of Dublin. But even admitting, which he (Sir R. Inglis) did not admit, that that country could be fairly drawn within the operation of that Act of Parliament, he believed it would be found that the language of the Act did not recognise the individual as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, but simply as exercising the functions of a Roman Catholic archbishop *in loco*. If such an act of foreign aggression as this had been attempted during the administration of a Minister like Mr. Perceval, he would not, like her Majesty's present Ministers, have permitted three months to elapse before taking steps to repress it, and to vindicate the honour and independence of the nation. Wherever the Church of Rome was dominant there was no peace for Dissenters. He (Sir R. Inglis) with humility thanked God that there had been found in this country, latent and unsuspected until the occasion called it forth, such a depth and extent of Protestant feeling and Protestant principle as this act of aggression had evoked. One of the features most remarkable in this agitation was the protest signed by men of all parties, by her Majesty's Attorney-General, and the leading members of the legal profession. The honourable and learned gentleman had left all but untouched the great question which was agitated in this country, and in which he (Sir R. Inglis) ventured to say no persons were more interested than the Dissenters of England. The Church of England, he believed, had protected Dissent; and he knew that, without such protection, Dissent would have been placed in a great deal of jeopardy. He looked upon the freedom of the Church of England as essential to the freedom of the people of England. The Church of England was the first of the three estates of the realm; it was an essential element in the Constitution of England, and whatever injured or weakened the Church, still more whatever affected the Protestant Church of this country, weakened and injured that which, under God's blessing, had been the chief source of the greatness and the glory of this country; and so long as Protestantism continued to be the religion of this nation, so long would the people grow in all the elements of social freedom.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNELL said—With respect to the attempt to establish a Catholic hierarchy in England, the spread of Catholicity in that country had rendered the appointment of vicars-apostolic necessary. It was said that the present was the only instance in which the Pope had presumed to appoint a hierarchy without the consent of the Government of the country. Even if this were so, was it not rather a credit to England that what was considered requisite for a Church, not the Church of the State, could yet be settled without subjecting her members to any penal proceedings? The honourable baronet (Sir R. Inglis) had cited the example of Prussia, but could scarcely wish it followed. And had the honourable baronet forgotten the case of Ireland, scarce seventy years since, under the penal laws, in which case the very course now objected to was pursued, of appointing a hierarchy without the consent of the Crown? No doubt, whenever it was practicable, the Pope endeavoured to obtain the assent of the temporal power to such a measure; for it had never been the policy of the Popedom (whatever might be the calumnies of English historians) to attempt to weaken or impair the legitimate rights of the constituted authorities. But the Pope might reasonably enough despair of receiving the assent of the Government in England. It was said that the Papal letters treated the people of this country as infidels. This, however, was not at all so. It was true, indeed, that the Holy See did not and could not recognise the Church established in this country as a Church, seeing that it was a principle of the Catholic faith that there could be but one Church, with one and the same visible head. But it was not true that the Pope had stigmatised the members of the Established Church as infidels; on the contrary, it would be repugnant to Catholic theology to use such a horrible accusation towards fellow Christians of any class. It was melancholy to think that the noble lord should have excited the spirit of religious bitterness when it was about to subside. But still more discreditable was the sequel. After the noble lord's letter, in which he had so grossly insulted the faith of the Catholics, it was naturally expected that, having thus expressed bigotry in words, he would have the manhood at least to attempt to carry it out in acts; instead of which he had shrunk from so doing, and so had earned the contempt not only of the Catholics, but of all friends of civil and religious liberty; for what was now apparent had been as wanton and as useless as it had been an unjustifiable outrage upon the religion of so large a portion of the people.

Mr. A. H. HORE said he should be sorry, for the sake of the character for consistency of his side of the House, if the only expression of its opinions were to be that of the honourable baronet the member for

Oxford, who seemed not to have considered the subject in its double aspect, affecting the Church on the one hand and the body politic on the other. As a member of the Church of England, he agreed with the honourable baronet in the expression of strong indignation—indeed, no one could feel more indignant—at the way in which the publications of the Roman Catholics had spoken of the recent aggression; alluding as they did to “the gentleman who claimed to fill the extinct see of Canterbury,” and the manner in which they had “ignored” the Church of England, as a member of which he was ready to fight to the utmost against the aggression. But the House should remember that they sat not there as members of the Church of England; they sat simply as representatives of the citizens of England—of that country which, pre-eminent as it was in civilisation, and intellect, and enlightenment, was most of all pre-eminent in its enunciation of the great doctrine of “civil and religious liberty.” The honourable baronet had referred to the precedents which he called (comparatively) old—as that of William III.; but although there were questions of law, or of the forms of Parliament, which had remained unchanged since those times, and on which this appeal might be proper, could it be so on a question of the treatment of members of another denomination since then set free? To be sure, the period might be appealed to upon shreds and patches of the question; but, to be consistent, they must be content to take the whole tone and spirit—the whole length, depth, and breadth of the Elizabethan era, and of the Stuart and the Tudor ideas about “liberty of conscience,” under which undoubtedly the Cardinal would have been hurled to the gallows, and the seconder of the Address would have had his ears cropped. (A laugh.) The first step towards liberty of conscience was the repeal of those barbarous laws. The second was the measure—for which, as a member of the Church of England, he thanked the noble lord opposite—by which was abolished the abominable “Test Act,” which prostituted the most sacred mysteries of religion to any one who might have conscience (or lack of conscience) enough to abjure for a time his religious convictions, in order to acquire that share of civil power which the State deprived him of in his true character. Such were the first two steps towards a more enlightened view of the relations between a man and his soul, on the one hand, and between a man and the body politic on the other. The next was the bill of 1829, since which various measures had been passed to consolidate the great foundation then laid—the only foundation on which a body politic of Anglo-Saxon race could in these times ever subsist; and now, because one of the religious bodies then emancipated had actually had the audacity to conceive that what was then given was given *boni fide*; when, with open eyes, Parliament had decreed that the Roman Catholic body should not, on account of holding Roman Catholic tenets, be debarred from the enjoyment of the full privileges of citizenship; one of their tenets being (as the Legislature all the while well knew) that they must look for spiritual rule to certain individuals holding territorial titles, and having a dependence upon another individual—a prelate, who happened to be also a petty Italian prince. Everything, indeed, that they now knew they knew (or ought to have known) in 1829, and ought to have provided against. Provision, in fact, was made, and the Roman Catholic prelates were debarred from taking the titles of twenty-six towns mentioned in the Act. They had not taken those names; and now the great, the magnanimous British nation, came down upon them with penal enactments, because they had attempted to act up to the letter of the charter of their emancipation; and what was called the “spirit” of the Emancipation Act was appealed to, by which it was sought to be shown that when an act prohibited taking the titles of twenty-six towns, those of the 15,000 places within England and Wales were also within prohibition. This might suit the “spirit” of the day, but if all statutes were construed in such a way, the country would not be so well ruled. It was said that the “liberties of Englishmen” had been “endangered,” and that the Magna Charta of Protestantism had been violated. He had thought that the liberties of England were built upon a firmer basis; and that the established religion of England had something to appeal to beyond the protection of the Act of 1829; and that it had truth and Scripture upon its side. But now it seemed that this was not so; for that though Dr. Wiseman might exercise all his episcopal powers in London as Bishop of Melipotamus, and the Church of England would still remain firmly founded upon Scripture and truth; yet if he exercised those powers as Archbishop of Westminster, then forsooth the people were all about to be made Papists, whether they would or not! This was, then, the mainstay of the Reformed Religion of which he had always imagined the appeal was to truth and reason; and which was to be rejected or refused upon those principles alone. For some time, unhappily, the principles of religious toleration had not been understood in England. But they had now come to understand them better, and year after year men had come round to the opinion, to which he did not yet altogether despair of seeing his honourable friend (Sir R. Inglis) a convert—that it was best to let different forms of faith, or claims of truth, contend with each other, without any interference on the part of the State. Having for his own part begun with rather exalted ideas as to the duty of the State to enforce its religion, he had become more and more emancipated from them; while at the same time he felt more and more attachment to the Church of England, not because she was established, but because she was, as he believed, founded upon truth, and strong enough in herself to resist all the machinations or aggressions of cardinals or archbishops, whether of Melipotamus or of Westminster. He could not, therefore, but look upon the whole course of the late meetings, and the notice which the Secretary for the Treasury had given, and the speech of the honourable baronet (Sir R. Inglis), as among the greatest blows ever inflicted upon the Church of England. The members of that Church had been taunted with being members of a mere “Act of Parliament Church,” and the honourable member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), in a speech, the greater part of which he (Mr. Hope) had heartily concurred with, had repeated the accusation, and declared that he could give no better definition of a member of the Church of England than that of a man who, in religious matters, bowed to the authority of that House. Now, although he (Mr. Hope) bowed to the authority of that House “on many questions, he certainly could not, did not, and always would not” bow to its authority on the subject of religion. Such, however, was the accusation. And how had it been answered by this agitation? Because a foreign prelate had sent thirteen bishops to England, with titles derived from as many of our towns, the Imperial Legislature, the representative of the greatest power in the world, was all in excitement about their religion being endangered, simply because these thirteen bishops had been sent with the titles of the towns in which they resided, and which titles the members of their communion would always continue to ascribe to them, in spite of all this legislation. If this were not humiliating and degrading for a great empire like this, he did not know what was humiliating, and degrading, and disgusting. It was said that the prerogative of the Crown had been insulted, and that something must be done to vindicate its dignity, and show that these titles were illegal. There was one obvious way of doing this; and that was to “ignore” them. The Roman Catholics had been emancipated, although it was known at the

time that the first tenet of their religion was, that they must be governed by territorial bishops. The law had been laid down that the exercise of those tenets was not inconsistent with the duties of citizenship, and the Roman Catholics had exercised those tenets, and had appointed bishops with territorial titles. As a member of the Church of England, no doubt he felt this annoying. It was annoying that, in the great city of Westminster, teeming with souls under the care of the Church of England, the opportunity should have been allowed (through a niggardly parsimony) to pass by for giving to the noble abbey its proper representative—a bishop of the Church of England, who would, among the “slums” of that city, search out the lost sheep of his flock. It was annoying that another, and an antagonistic body, should have seized the opportunity thus neglected by the Church of England. The House, however, were not assembled there as members of the Church of England, but as citizens of the British empire, in which all religions had the rewards of citizenship equally free and unrestricted. The Cardinal’s title, like that of the “President of the Conference” with the Wesleyans, might not be recognised by law, except that in a suit evidence might be given that he exercised a certain authority over Roman Catholics. The nation might, if it pleased, “ignore” the title, and refuse the Roman Catholic hierarchy admission at Court. Private individuals might, if they liked, have the bad taste to address the Cardinal as Mr. Wiseman, or Nicholas Wiseman. This would be offensive enough, but this was just what the nation as a body was going to do. But would this course be worthy of a great nation? Would it be creditable to imitate the discourtesy which would be considered discredit among private individuals? It was but showing our own weakness, and confessing that our faith and religion rested only on Acts of Parliament, and that a pastoral letter from Rome would pull down our Throne and peril our religion. He (Mr. Hope) however, had more faith in the Crown of England, and more faith in the Church of England also.

Mr. C. ANSTAY said he did not conceive the Address at all embodied the spirit of persecution; and those members who considered that it did should show their sincerity and consistency by proposing an amendment. He did not find either in the Speech or in the Address any such principle laid down, nor any allusion to it, nor a single syllable to which, as a member of the Church of Rome (but not of the Court of Rome), he could not heartily subscribe. It had been erroneously imagined that all Protestants were against the Papal measure and all Catholics in favour of it. Ever since 1829 this subject had been contested, between the bishops on the one hand, and the clergy and the laity on the other. There were petitions from the latter to the Holy See, praying for a solution of the doubt, and for the establishment of a hierarchy of their own selection. These petitions, however, were opposed by counter-petitions. In 1836 the hierarchy might have been had by the English Catholics, but there were petitions against it, some of which he (Mr. Anstey) got up; and the Pope held his hand, and sent to this country a scheme which was not to be carried out until a code of laws should have been adopted, by which the rights of the patrons should be secured. The clergy and laity accepted it, but the bishops did not. Ever since then there had been a contest on the subject, and it was quite by a sort of surprise that the Papal brief had been issued, repealing the canon law in this country, and giving the bishops power to frame laws for the future regulation of the spiritual and ecclesiastical concerns of the Roman Catholic Church. The Papal brief would become *quasi* for the Roman Catholics; and so far for the courts of this country, that they would be bound to take notice of it in legal suits, as in the administration, for instance, of charity funds by the Court of Chancery; for by the course of that court, which was part of the law of the land, the Papal brief and bulls would be recognised as the *quasi* bye-laws or ordinances of the Catholics, by which they regulated their ecclesiastical affairs. Surely the ecclesiastical interest of a million and a half of people were worthy of consideration, and the Address only assured the Crown that the subject should be considered. The bill must either be acquiesced in or forbidden, or some steps must be taken upon it. They were called upon to advise her Majesty; and when he was told that they ought not to legislate upon questions respecting submission to undue influences, he must answer that the objection came rather late. Had they not over and over again legislated in order to keep down undue influence? On what ground did they pass the statute of mortmain? On what ground did they defeat testaments when obtained under circumstances surrounded with suspicion? How frequently has it been held by the court a sufficient evidence of fraud when a legacy has been left to the physician who has attended the dying moments of a testator, and yet how natural does not a bequest of such a kind appear? If there was any force in the objection, why did they interfere between the labourer and the master—between the mill-owner and the factory-child? They were told then that the parties were free agents—that they were contracting parties, and that there was no undue weight of influence on one side or the other. But they knew that there were concessions, and that those concessions must be what power and wealth always wrings from poverty. It was impossible, spiritually speaking, for the Roman Catholics of these countries, unless they passed temporal obstacles in the way of this Papal assumption, to escape the consequences of this bull. Submit they must, sooner or later. It was not in human nature to bear the denial of the Sacrament, the exclusion from those rights and privileges which the Church accorded to her members, and which exclusion would be the penalty of disobedience. It has always been the policy of the Court of Rome—a wise and humane policy—to take external difficulties into consideration. Where these are of magnitude, obedience to her mandates are not strictly enforced. He would apologise to the House if he entered upon a matter somewhat personal to himself. The honourable member for Sheffield had said, that in 1848 it was understood that an Archbishop of Westminster was going to be appointed, and that it was well known that no protest had been made against it. Now, a protest had been made against it by the right honourable baronet the member for Oxford, upon the occasion when he (Mr. Anstey) introduced a bill to repeal the Roman Catholic disabilities, and then he made a statement which he had no doubt was true at the time. He stated that before there could be an Archbishop of Westminster there should be an hierarchy, and that there could be no hierarchy without clerical legislation, which he understood had been in contemplation, but which had been postponed *sine die*, in consequence of the revolution which broke out in Rome. Maintaining, as he hoped he should always maintain, the deepest respect for the person and office of the Pope, he must say that there had been a most unfavourable and most unfortunate change in his policy. He thought it was a lamentable thing that the great reformer of 1846 and 1847, utterly unmindful of his former glories, should place himself at the head of the contemptible and reactionary section who now occupied the capital of the Christian world. He thought he could defend the noble lord from the charge that this intended creation had been notified to Lord Minto, and no renunciation had been made. He believed that it was not until Cardinal Wiseman went to Rome last summer that it was finally decided upon, and it was then left to his own choice whether he would come back veier apostolic or cardinal arch-

bishop. He had never missed an opportunity of recording his sentiments in favour of civil and religious liberty, and it was not likely that he should begin the trade of persecution on the professors of his own religion; for he was a member of the Church of Rome. If the Ministers proposed to them a bill which was equal to the occasion, he cared not what might be the personal consequences arising from his faith and affecting his position, he would give them the humble benefit of his vote. But if the bill was reduced to the barren question of title he would not support it, neither would he support any portion of the bill which might relate to Ireland, a country the position of which was so widely different from that of England, a country which had never lost its hierarchy, a country which has never submitted to the imposition of canon law from the hands of any bishop or vicar-apostolic, but which has been fortunate enough to retain its ancient usages and *Jus canonicum* which originated in the days of St. Patrick.

The Earl of ARUNDEL was ready to waive discussion upon the proposition of the noble lord until it was presented in a tangible shape; but he would say this, that whatever attack was made on the perfect liberty of the Roman Catholic Church, he, in his place in Parliament, would oppose it; and if a measure of persecution should pass—if their opponents were too strong for them—the members of his Church knew how to suffer with dignity.

Mr. FAGAN denied the assertion of the member for Youghal, that the Roman Catholic Church was endowed in England. His great reason for resisting any proposition for interference was that the Church, neither in England or Ireland, was endowed; and not being so, they had no right to any interference whatever. The honourable gentleman had told them that a conflict had been going on for years between the Catholic bishops and the second clergy. What was the cause of this conflict? Why, that the second order of the clergy had no rights whatever. They were under the entire control of the bishops, by reason of the non-existence of canonical institutions. Well, this Papal brief restored these rights, and he was told that it was only because of the great excitement, that some step had not been taken to have a synod brought together for the purpose of promulgating a law which would give these canonical rights. After the Speech from the Throne, the Catholic members assembled together, and it was resolved not to discuss the question, but the hon. member for Youghal had thrown the apple of discord among them, and it was impossible to preserve silence. He was not satisfied that the Address had been allowed to pass over without amendment, for he could not discover that Address from the notice of motion which the noble lord had given. The noble lord had intimated his intention of introducing a penal measure early this week, directed against the religious liberties of a large portion of the people of these realms. It was true that this proposition was in direct contradiction of the sentiments which the noble lord had, over and over again, expressed regarding religious liberty, and it was equally true that the measure of the noble lord would be ineffective, for the title would still exist, notwithstanding any Act of Parliament. But at the same time he could not but regard it, however weak, as an attack on the civil and religious liberty of the Roman Catholics. He perfectly agreed in the sentiments which had been so ably expressed by the honourable member for Sheffield. Roman Catholics did not recognise the Pope as the head of a temporal power—his authority was only spiritual; and that spiritual supremacy was recognised in the oath which Parliament had directed should be taken by Roman Catholics.

Mr. HUME observed that if a stranger entered the House, he would be sure to imagine that they were a set of ecclesiastics met to discuss some Church question. No notice had been taken of any other matter. It appeared to him, from the discussion, and from the difference of opinion expressed by Roman Catholics themselves, that they were not in a position to offer any opinion on what the measure was. He perfectly agreed with the sentiments which had been expressed by the honourable member for Sheffield, and he believed that thousands in this country, when they came to reflect on the true state of the question, would wonder how they could have been so led away. No one had attempted to answer or controvert the arguments of the hon. member, nor show that he had taken an erroneous view. If he were to judge from the Speech of her Majesty, no danger would arise from the proposed measure. "I have, at the same time, expressed my earnest desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the religious liberty which is so justly prized by the people of this country." He took that to be the ground on which the motion of the noble lord would be founded. They had thirty-eight bishops and 18,000 clergymen to maintain the faith, besides 14,000 belonging to dissenting institutions, and what ought to be the danger if these men did their duty? He must concur in the opinion of the hon. member for Maidstone, that there was no necessity for the power of the State being called upon to support the Protestant religion. If it could not be maintained without the power of the State, it must be weak indeed in argument, and its foundations could not be solid. When he referred to the power which the Protestant Church had in this country, to the number of its advocates, and to the amount of its funds (for that was an important point), it did appear to him that the present outcry placed the country in a humiliating position. He would, however, postpone any further observations upon this subject till he had the pleasure of hearing the provisions of the measure which the noble lord intended to bring forward, being firmly determined at the same time to do all that was in his power to resist every measure which savoured of persecution. But he could not believe that the noble lord, whom he had followed for years as the great advocate and champion of religious liberty; he could not believe that at this time he would so far sully his character as to introduce any measure which would be of a persecuting nature; and, be it remembered, that any measure of coercion, however trifling it might be, would be a measure of persecution.

Mr. GRATTAN said if honourable gentlemen on the Treasury bench thought they could go quietly back to a restoration of the penal laws in Ireland, they never made a greater mistake in their lives. This was not an age for such an experiment, either on our intellect or our passions. Either it was meant to settle the question in the year 1829, or it was not. If you meant to settle the question in that year, then let it be; but if you did not mean to settle it, then your measures were right in point of logic at least. He could not understand how any Minister could have written such a letter as the noble lord at the head of the Government had done; it was only to be explained on the supposition that it was written after dinner. It was not so much a letter against the Pope as a letter against Ireland. It was a most unwarrantable liberty to calumniate and criticise the religion of one's neighbour. To denounce the Catholic rites as mummeries of superstition was not a charge against English, Irish, or Scottish Catholics only, but against Catholics throughout the world. When the noble lord talked of Catholicism contracting the mind and enslaving the soul, he ought to have called to mind the productions of Fenelon, Metastasio, and a hundred other great writers who belonged to the Catholic Church. Was it in their works that such doctrines could be found? It was sufficient to settle the question as to the right of the Pope to create Catholic bishops, that in an act

which had been passed by Parliament, the title of Roman Catholic Bishop of Galway was given to Dr. Blake. If they were continually to insult the people by Ministerial rescripts, and to gail them by laws, it was vain to expect that they could ever have peace and tranquillity in Ireland. He wished to give notice that he should move that the words "United Kingdom" be struck out of the bill. A gross delusion was attempted by those who boasted themselves the friends of civil and religious liberty; there was neither Christianity nor decent regard for justice in penal laws, or in such speeches as those which had been made at public meetings on this question.

After a few words from Col. Sibthorp, Mr. Grantley Berkeley, and Mr. Banks,

Lord J. RUSSELL rose and said: Mr. Speaker, I am rejoiced to find that we are not likely to have a division on the question of the Address, and that that Address is likely to be passed by the House with unanimity. I pass now to another question, upon which a great part of this debate has turned, and upon which there has been much discussion in the country for the last few months. And in doing so I must, of course, refer to the opinions of the hon. and learned member for Sheffield, who began this debate, and who blamed the Government, and blamed me more especially, for the part that I had taken. The hon. and learned gentleman said that he approached this question with great pain, and that it was not merely from compliance with custom that he used these words, but that he really felt great pain on this subject. Now, allow me to suggest to the hon. and learned gentleman that I think his pain would be diminished if he would not fall into that way of supposing that some mean motives have always actuated parties, and the leaders of parties, in this country; and if he would admit that, though they may differ in opinion, and may be utterly mistaken, they may have somewhat higher motives for their conduct than he at present seems to suppose. For if no other than those very low motives actuated public men, he is in a country which is governed by men of one party or the other who have some mean jealousy, or some hope of a fleeting popularity to gratify, and over whom no other and better motives have influence. It appears, according to the honourable and learned gentleman's statement, that when Sir Robert Peel proposed to relieve the Roman Catholics from their disabilities, that a great jealousy immediately arose on the part of those who had been always friendly to that measure. Now, that is a gratuitous assumption on the part of the honourable gentleman. The fact is, that we gave at that time the utmost support to that eminent statesman now deceased, who was taking a course which we thought greatly for the benefit of this country, and he expressed his grateful sense of the support which he received from us. I remember, during one of the debates on that measure, some member of this House taunting others for having changed their opinions, and I said that I hoped during the whole of the discussions that took place on the bill of 1829 there would be none of those reproaches for change of opinion which the members who had spoken seemed to be inclined to indulge in. When we saw that which we had always thought a great benefit to the country proposed, and that which we thought necessary for the peace of Ireland about to be accomplished, our course was not one dictated by jealousy that it was not proposed by ourselves. We did not claim credit for any extraordinary pitch of heroic virtue, but we had that feeling that we were anxious for the welfare of the country, and we were glad to see it proposed. So with respect to that letter which I wrote to the Bishop of Durham; it was not to make political capital that I wrote that letter, but because I entertained the sentiments that I then expressed, and, rightly or wrongly, I could not refrain from giving expression to them, or from giving publicity to those expressions. Well, then, perhaps the honourable and learned gentleman may in future save himself some of that pain which he has felt if he will take rather a more charitable view of others, and thus he will not expose himself to the retort which I have sometimes been accustomed to make to those who throw out these reproaches, namely, an observation that was made by the great Prince of Condé when he read some pamphlets that had been written against himself and the Cardinal de Retz. He said, "These gentlemen make us act as they would themselves act if they were in our places." Well, now, sir, with respect to that question, which every one must admit has occupied the attention of the public during the last three months to a very great degree, I must say that I cannot at all take the view which the honourable and learned member for Sheffield takes of it, and which I have no doubt that he most sincerely takes, that this was a mere use of a title; that it was a matter of perfect indifference, and that it might have been left unnoticed. I own I do not agree with him that it implies any ignorance of history that I should have taken a different view. On the contrary, I consider that history teaches that whatever may be the opinions of the Roman Catholics in different countries, that the Court of Rome—properly distinguished from the Church of Rome by the honourable and learned gentleman—that I say the Court of Rome has for ever watched opportunities of making aggressions, not on the spiritual conscience, but on the temporal interests of the kingdoms with which it was concerned. This history teaches; and I do find that some of the greatest friends of liberty—Sir John Elliot (from whom Lord St. Germain was descended), Pym, Hampden, Lord Somers, and John Locke—all these men, friends of liberty as they were, had a great distrust of Papal assumption and of Papal aggression. Well, sir, what was the condition of the Roman Catholics in this country? For it has been represented as if we, the Protestants of this country, and I among the foremost of them, were all suddenly seized with a rage of persecution, and could not refrain from raising a cry of bigotry and tyranny against our Roman Catholic fellow-men. Now what is the true state of the case? In 1791 the priests of the Roman Catholic religion and the Roman Catholics were allowed complete freedom in the exercise of their religion. In 1829 they obtained complete freedom to sit in Parliament, and have all civil employments, with trifling exceptions. Since that year, on various occasions, alterations have been made and innovations introduced with respect to our laws favourable to the Roman Catholics. With respect to the actual enjoyment of the privileges granted in 1829, the present Government, at least, cannot be blamed by the Roman Catholics; for whether in the Queen's household or the civil administration, or on the bench of justice, the talents of the Roman Catholics have been acknowledged and admitted as fully as those of any Protestants, or of any persons holding the opinions of the Established Church, and having offices of civil employment. At this moment, of the three chief judges of the courts of law in Ireland two are Roman Catholic. With respect to other instances, we have been blamed rather for giving to Roman Catholics precedence and titles which gentlemen think they were not entitled to. One instance has been cited by the honourable and learned member for Sheffield, which certainly occurred, but of which, till lately, I did not know the history—namely, that in the Lord Chamberlain's department it was stated that the Roman Catholic Primate and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin had precedence at the *entree* at the Castle; but this was found to be the act of a subordinate in the Lord Chamberlain's department, and it was entered in the *Gazette* quite

unusually, and during the hurry of her Majesty's visit. With regard to other cases, I am prepared to avow and to defend the various instances in which Roman Catholics have received more honour and more favour than some gentlemen consider they could fairly claim. But what I am contending for now is, that there was really no reason to complain, on the part of the Roman Catholics; with their full and free exercise of their religion—with all the civil privileges they enjoy quite as much as Protestants—what right have they to complain of their situation? Well, it is in the midst of these occurrences, there having been vicars apostolic in this country for 300 years, having had vicars apostolic, and nothing but vicars apostolic, during the reign of James II., when every one of the principal councillors of the King was a Roman Catholic, the feeling seized the Court of Rome to issue a sort of edict, saying that this country was to be divided into an archbishopric and bishoprics; and the chief persons created by these orders, an archbishop—and archbishop of Westminster, of all other places!—in his letters, immediately proclaimed to all the people of this country "We govern, and shall continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Hertford." Sir, was that a spiritual change? "The counties of Essex and Hertford?" I see the hon. gentlemen the representatives of these counties opposite to me. Were these counties merely bodies of Roman Catholics? It must be—indeed, the whole wording and construction of the documents appeared to be a pretension to rule these counties, and all the counties of England under the whole sway of this new hierarchy of bishops. I might have been mistaken in this, but there was a person of great eminence, of great learning, of great talents, whom we all have to deplore as having ever left the Protestant Church and joined the Church of Rome—I mean Mr. Newman. And Mr. Newman said there was scarcely ever an instance that had happened before of a nation which had entirely abandoned the Church of Rome returning again to its communion; but he was happy to say that that example had occurred in England, and he said that the English people had now returned to obedience to the Holy See. Why, what does that mean? If the Queen had come down to Parliament, as Queen Mary came to Parliament, and had declared that the time was come when the nation should return to the faith and to the obedience of the See of Rome, and the House of Lords and the House of Commons concurred with her Majesty, and had passed an Act for that purpose, there could hardly have been a declaration going further than the declaration of Mr. Newman must be understood to mean. But, beyond this, the usual organs in this country and in France, not of the Roman Catholic party, but of the party of ultramontane Roman Catholics—their organs proclaimed that this was an act of great significance, not merely for one archbishop and twelve bishops to be in England, but to take the place of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and our other bishops—I say it did appear to me that we could not pass in silence over such a pretension. Now I ask the hon. member for Sheffield, if it had been passed over in silence by the people of England, whether we should not have had some other step immediately following? We can easily imagine that step. It is not necessary to state what it would be now. But I believe that the opinion which has been given so generally, nearly so universally, on the part of the Church of England, and on the part of the great majority of Protestant Dissenters, I believe it will have convinced not only the Roman Catholics in England, whom I really believe wish no such step to be taken, but also will have convinced the Court of Rome that this country of England is clearly not a Roman Catholic but a Protestant country, and that at all events, in fact—however erroneous Protestantism may be—the great body of the people of England are Protestants. Well, if such be the case, and such be the effect of the Address now proposed to be passed, by this declaration of itself we shall have saved ourselves from many attempts of the Court of Rome that would lead to an interference with the independence of this country. But I said that the Roman Catholics in England, generally, did not wish this step to be taken. In looking at the Papal documents, I always find that the vicars apostolic are put forward, and that the vicars apostolic wished to be bishops with titles taken from sees in this country; and it appeared that certain advantages, certain powers over endowments, and certain privileges which do not belong to vicars apostolic, would have belonged to them, if they could establish themselves over the Roman Catholics as bishops in those sees—a very good reason why the vicars apostolic should wish to claim these titles. But I believe that, generally speaking, the lay Roman Catholics of this country, although, when the measure was taken they could hardly repudiate it—they in general neither wish nor approve of it at the present time. I have been assured so, not by Protestants, but by Roman Catholics and Roman Catholic priests, and I believe that we stand now, at all events, in a position in which we can take measures which not only may be satisfactory to Protestants, but which will be satisfactory to the loyal Roman Catholics who wish to preserve their allegiance to the Crown undiminished and unimpaired, and who dread the prevalence of ultramontane doctrines, which in every country in Europe have been formidable to Roman Catholics who have any regard for freedom and independence. Well, sir, such I believe, then, is the cause of the strong feeling engendered and excited in this country, and such, I believe, is the present opinion of Protestants as well as Roman Catholics. The honourable gentleman the member for Kent has warned me that in dealing with this subject I should beware of the very strong sentiments which are entertained upon it, and that I should not fall short of the expectations of the people of this country. Now, sir, I am ready to state that I shall be prepared to propose measures as strong as my own convictions suggest. I shall not yield to any one in that respect, and I shall not shrink from performing any part that I think right. But I cannot, on the other hand, introduce measures which I think at all go beyond the occasion, or which would in any way trench on what I think due to the religious liberty of all classes of her Majesty's subjects. I shall endeavour to meet the present emergency. My opinion is, that the authority of Parliament will be sufficient to check these proceedings, and that the voice which has been uttered in no uncertain manner by the people of this country will tend to the maintenance of harmony between the different classes of Christians. But, sir, I shall not attempt to go beyond what is needed. The hon. gentleman the member for Limerick has said that I have grossly insulted the faith of the Roman Catholics. Now, I beg, sir, to deny that I ever have insulted the faith of the Roman Catholics. I did make observations which I thought justified with respect to a party of the Church to which I belong. (Hear, hear.) I do not think, whether those observations were right or wrong, that I am to be precluded from making any remarks which I think just with respect to a part of my own Church because Roman Catholics may say that these observations are applicable to them. It is for them to decide whether they think these observations to be applicable to them. It is sufficient for me to say that I applied them to those who belonged to my own Church, and I did not speak in manner or words any stronger than the bishop of the diocese in which I reside. With respect, then, to this question, I shall have on Friday to state what is the present state of this subject, and what is the remedy I shall have the honour to propose to it shall be. It will be a measure, I may now state, extending to the whole of the United

Kingdom. There have been, I know, some rumours of a contrary nature; but we have never had any intention to introduce a measure that would not apply to the whole of the United Kingdom. I do not, however, think it necessary to enter further into that subject at present. I do trust that in the future course of our legislation, as well as in the past course of our legislation, we may be able to maintain those principles of religious liberty which are so happily established among us; and I believe, if there is anything at Rome they disapprove, it is that very fact of the civil and religious liberty of this country. It is that of which they disapprove; it is that which they see here that they most loathe to endure. I confess I was at a loss to understand why, when the position of the Roman Catholics in this country was so advantageous as I have stated it to be, and as I think it cannot be denied to have been, why the Court of Rome should have taken this course. I should be the last person to attribute it to any personal ill-will towards this country on the part of the Court of Rome. I stated, speaking last year of the revolution by which the Sovereign of the Roman States was overthrown, that I lamented that a man of such benevolent intentions should have had the affliction of seeing his Minister assassinated as he was passing from the Legislative Council, and obliged himself to leave the seat of his Government. I really felt compassion at such a result. I believe that he has not entertained any ill-will towards this country. But I observe that, which I am unable to understand, by a letter addressed to myself by the Earl of Shrewsbury, there is a party at Rome who are the enemies of England, and that party is prevalent at the Court of Rome. Now, if that is the case, and Lord Shrewsbury is a good witness as to the fact, I think it goes far to explain the measures we have recently seen taken. I trust that better counsels, however, will prevail; but whatever may be the case in that respect, and however much we may have reason to complain of the conduct which has been followed at Rome, although we might think it right to state that we had been wrong in this matter, I do not think it would be advisable for the Ministers of this country to endeavour to make any treaty of the nature of what is called a *concordat*. I am persuaded that we have sufficient means within ourselves, by our own polity, by our own customs and habits of discussion, and by the authority of our own Parliament, to provide against the danger of any aggression or any assumption to which we may be subjected. It is to that after all, as in the letter that has been so much objected to I stated, that I look with confidence and reliance. It is to the freedom of this country, to her civil and religious liberty, and the attachment which the people of this country have for those principles, endeared to them as they are, that I look with confidence for the frustration of any aggression of any foreign power, or any assumption of universal spiritual jurisdiction. The motion for the adoption of the Address was then put and agreed to, and a committee was appointed to prepare the Address.

CONTENTS OF SERIES I. TO XVII., price 1*d.* each.

FIRST SERIES.—The Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX.; Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral; the two Letters to the "Times" by Bishop Ullathorne; Lord John Russell's Letter; the "New Batch of Bishops," from the "Weekly Dispatch;" two Letters by the Rev. G. A. Denison; a Letter from Benjamin D'Israeli, Esq., M.P.; Review and Extracts from Ambrose Phillips's "Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury;" concluded by a Biography of Cardinal Wiseman.

SECOND SERIES.—The Bishop of London's Charge, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 2, 1850; and the Rev. Dr. Cumming's Lecture, at Hanover-square Rooms, Nov. 7, 1850.

THIRD SERIES.—The Rev. T. Nolan's Lecture; Letter from B. Hawes, Esq., M.P.; the Pastoral of the Catholic Bishop of Northampton; Letter from Dr. Cumming; Letters from the Bishop of St. Asaph and Viscount Feilding; and the "Vatican Masquerade."

FOURTH SERIES.—A Plain Appeal to the Common Sense of all the Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, by John Bull; Two Speeches of the Very Rev. the Dean of Bristol; and the "Queen and the Pope."

FIFTH SERIES.—An Appeal to the English People, by Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, copiously analysed by John Bull, Editor and Commentator; and Leading Articles from the Morning Papers of November 21.

SIXTH SERIES.—The Second Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Cumming, and a Note by the Editor; the Letter of the Hon. Mr. Langdale; the Birmingham Memorial; the Letter of "Catholius;" Cardinal Wiseman; a Roman Catholic Explanation of the Papal Aggression; and the Conversion of H. W. Wilberforce.

SEVENTH SERIES.—Leading Articles on Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto, from the Daily and Weekly Press; also Letters and Replies from the Bishops of the Established Church.

EIGHTH SERIES.—Letter from Joseph Hume, Esq., M.P.; Fourteen Letters from Bishops of the Established Church; Dr. Doyle's Sermon, Nov. 17th; Catholic Bishop of Newport's Pastoral; and a Letter from a Correspondent.

NINTH SERIES.—Mr. Roebuck's Letter to Lord John Russell; the Rev. Mr. Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell; and Letter from Sir Benjamin Hall, Bart., M.P., to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

TENTH SERIES.—Sermons by Cardinal Wiseman at St. George's Catholic Church, Southwark; Letters from Dr. Cumming and Mr. Bowyer; and the Address from the Bishops to the Queen.

ELEVENTH SERIES.—Addresses to the Crown; Resignation of Mr. Bennett, of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; the Protestant Agitation, by "Carolus;" and Lord Beaumont's Letter to the Earl of Zetland.

TWELFTH SERIES.—Correspondence between the Bishop of London and the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett; the Duke of Norfolk; Roman Catholic "Pastorals;" and Lord John Russell and the Puseyites.

THIRTEENTH SERIES.—The Canterbury and Exeter Correspondence; the Bishop of St. David's and the Archbishop of Canterbury; Cardinal Wiseman's Second Lecture; the Rev. Dr. McNeile; the Bishop of Norwich; and Episcopal Church in Scotland.

FOURTEENTH SERIES.—The Church, the State, and the People; Speech of Sir Edward Sugden at the Surrey County Meeting at Epsom; Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Cumming, and Mr. Bowyer; the Bishop of Hereford and the Bishop of Carlisle; Mr. Molyneux Taylor; and A Few More Words to Englishmen of all Persuasions.

SIXTEENTH SERIES.—What's it all About? (from "Tait's Magazine"); the Ministers and the Pope; and the Remonstrance of the Irish Prelates.

THE NINETEENTH SERIES will contain Lord John Russell's Bill to be presented to the House of Commons on the 7th of February, and the Debates thereon.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

PAPAL AGGRESSION.—HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FEB. 7, 1851.

Lord J. RUSSELL rose, in pursuance of the notice he had given, to move for leave to bring in a bill "to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." The noble lord spoke as follows:—The House, I am sure, will readily believe the anxiety with which I approach the important subject which I promised to bring under their notice, the deep interest which is felt in this country by all classes of persons, the numerous petitions that have been presented to this House, praying the House to resist encroachment on the part of a foreign Sovereign, the addresses presented to the Crown, all making it a matter of deep responsibility to undertake the task of bringing such a question before the House. That anxiety is not diminished, but increased, by the indications that were given the other evening of the disposition of a great portion of the House. One hon. gentleman, the member for Sheffield, who spoke on that occasion, warned me not to take a retrograde step. Another hon. gentleman, the member for Buckinghamshire, warned me, on the other side, not to introduce anything less than a complete code regulating all the relations which might occur between the Court of Rome and her Majesty's subjects in the United Kingdom. With respect to the first of those observations—that I should not take a retrograde step—the language I should hold would be, that the only retrograde step I propose to take is that natural action of a man who finds that a blow is aimed at his head, and who steps backward to raise his arm, and put himself in a posture of defence. With respect to the other observation, I shall not now enter into a consideration of the reason why I differ from the hon. member who made it; but in the course of the statement I have to make I shall address those remarks to the House which appear to me to belong to the subject, and state those motives which have induced the Government not to pursue the course which is the one he has suggested as the most proper. In bringing this subject before the House, I beg the House to recollect some circumstances that occurred at a very recent period. In the course of last year the nomination of an archbishop in Ireland by the Roman see was made in an unusual manner. It was generally understood, and has never been contradicted, that those who usually elect to the office of archbishop on the part of the Roman Catholics in Ireland had sent three names to Rome, but that instead of any one of those learned ecclesiastics being chosen who had been proposed for that office, a clergyman who had been long resident at Rome, who was more conversant with the habits and opinions of Rome than with the state and circumstances of Ireland, was named by the Pope to assume the office of archbishop in Ireland. No sooner did that ecclesiastic arrive than he showed very clearly that it was not his intention to follow the usual practice that had been observed by Archbishop Murray and others, of putting themselves into communication, in relation to any matters necessary to be transacted between them, with the Irish Government. Presently we found that a Synod had been called at Thurles, which assembled. It was stated that at that Synod a question was raised whether or not an address should be issued to the people of Ireland, and that that motion was carried by a majority of 13 to 12, being a majority consisting of that very person who had been sent over from Rome, whose views were foreign to the state of Ireland, and who prompted that determination. An address was accordingly issued. Well, if that address had been confined to matters of the internal discipline of the Roman Catholic religion—if it had been shown that, with respect to matters of internal discipline, there was a variety of practice in different parts of Ireland, and that the Synod had met for the purpose of regulating those matters—however unusual and entirely without precedent, for no such meeting had taken place since the time of the Revolution, the assembling of a Synod might be, I could have understood its object. But a great portion of that address was taken up with two subjects. The one was the danger of the system of education in the colleges established by the Queen in conformity with an Act of Parliament. It stated that, however good the intentions of the Legislature might be, those colleges were established in ignorance of the inflexible nature of the Roman Catholic Church; and it pointed out that they could not but be attended with danger to the faith and morals of those who were of that Church. Another part of that address was taken up with descriptions of the state of that part of the poorer portion of the Irish peasantry who had been evicted. And I must say that no language was omitted which could excite the feelings of that peasant class against those who were owners of land, and who had enforced the process of the law against their tenants. I am not going at the present time to enter into any defence of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland; nor am I about to discuss the question whether the Irish landlords have acted with discretion and humanity in the use of their legal rights; but I point this out to the House as a most important circumstance, that on the question of education, that on questions of the occupancy of land, the Synod, which consisted entirely of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, from which all laymen were excluded, thought it proper, on this their first meeting, to hold forth to

the Irish people, and tell them what should be their duty and conduct on those two subjects. I must ask the hon. member for Sheffield whether this is a matter of entirely spiritual concern? Whether this House and the Government of the country can be entirely indifferent, when they see that an archbishop has been thus named, purposely of course instructed, and aware of the intentions at Rome, and that the first proceeding he carries into effect is to hold forth to odium an Act of Parliament passed by this country for the purpose of educating the people of Ireland, of giving better instruction to the higher and middle classes; while likewise exciting to hatred of the owners of land a great portion of the population of that kingdom? This, I think, is an instance, at all events, that we have not to deal with purely spiritual concerns; that that interference, which is so well known in all modern history of clerical bodies, with the temporal and civil concerns of the State, has been attempted, not as a system, but as a beginning—as a beginning, no doubt, to be matured into other measures, and to be exerted on some future occasion with more potent results. If there is one part of this transaction which merits remark, as it may have excited attention—and I own it excited mine—it is the signature to the published address of the Synod of Thurles. In a copy I received of that address it was stated to be published “by authority,” and purported to be signed at the end, “Paul, Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of Ireland.” I received from the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland a communication stating that his attention had likewise been drawn to that circumstance; that he had consulted those who were best qualified to assist him in the construction of the law; and that they had informed him that, although if the Roman Catholic Archbishop had assumed the title of Archbishop of Armagh in any document of which they were in possession, they could then apply the law to the case, yet the appearance in print of that name would not be evidence in a court of law, and that they were not likely to obtain from the printer any evidence—even should such be the fact—that Dr. Cullen had signed that document. They thought it probable that he had not signed it, but that his name had been affixed to it. Now, having stated that occurrence, I shall refer to some other occurrences which took place about the same time, not in this country, but on the continent of Europe. One was a circumstance which took place in the kingdom of Sardinia. Until very lately a law had been in force in Piedmont which had not been for many years the usual law of most of the States of Europe. It was, that ecclesiastics should only be amenable to the ecclesiastical tribunals, and that certain places should possess what was called the right of asylum. It appears that the Sardinian Government and the Sardinian Parliament assembled at Turin, changed the law in these respects and made it similar to that which prevailed in other parts of Europe. They declared that, with regard to all temporal matters, clergymen should be tried before the temporal and civil tribunals of the land, and that the right of asylum should be taken away. One of the Ministers, who was a party to making that law, was soon afterwards taken dangerously ill, and when he required the sacrament, and made his confession, he was asked whether he would repent of the consent which he had given to the new law which had been passed? Instead of doing so he made a counter-declaration, which was not satisfactory to the Archbishop of Turin, and the consequence was that he died without receiving the sacraments of the Church, as a person who was without the pale of the Church. That was an instance of the interference of spiritual power and spiritual censure, for the purpose of controlling, of directing, and of terrifying a Minister of the Crown and a Member of Parliament, on account of his conduct as a Minister and a member of the Parliament to which he belonged. Now, I beg the House to observe these things, because they are not altogether foreign to us. They may not be intended here this year or next year; but we are told in the writing to which I have alluded that the doctrines of the Court of Rome are inflexible—that their maxims are unchangeable. They may not think it expedient to introduce such a practice into this country now, but they retain in their hands the power of applying those maxims, of applying those censures, of applying those most formidable and awful spiritual powers which they possess. About the same time, or it may be a little after, there appeared a rescript from Rome in Belgium with respect to the conduct of the Government of that country. Now, the Government of Belgium, from the commencement of its independence, had taken a course more favourable to the independence of the Roman Catholic Church than any other country in Europe had done, because it had allowed the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical body to enjoy all their endowments, while at the same time the civil Government was entirely without any power of interference with the nomination or conduct of clergymen. But it was found, with regard to the civil education which the State had provided, that that education had dropped very much indeed into the hands of the bishops of the Church of Rome, and the Belgian Chambers, consisting in great part of Roman Catholics, anxious for the interests of the State, took means to provide for the security of education in Belgium. The step they took was impugned by the head of the Church of Rome. A document disapproving it was published, and it was generally believed that that document was circulated at the time it was that it might exert an influence over the elections, and thereby induce the Belgian Chambers to alter their decision. However, it was not much regarded, and when the Minister was questioned on the subject he produced a despatch in which he had desired the Belgian Minister to inform the Secretary of State at Rome that the Pope had been entirely misinformed—that the facts were not as had been represented to him, and that no course had been taken by the Government which was opposed to the interests of the Church of Rome. The subject provoked a good deal of discussion, but a great majority approved of the conduct of the Belgian Government in the matter. Then came the proceedings more immediately connected with this country. At the end of September letters apostolic were issued, declaring that Rome had altered the

ecclesiastical arrangement that had prevailed in this country, altering it from the arrangement of vicars-apostolic and proposing to establish an archbishop and bishops, among whom the country was to be divided. I shall hereafter state the view which I take of that document. What I wish to say now is, that that change was made entirely without the consent—I may say entirely without the knowledge—of the Government of this country. Sir, the hon. member for Sheffield referred the other day to a remark that, in 1848, in the course of discussion, I made in answer to some observation or question of my hon. friend the member for the University of Oxford, viz., that I did not know that the Pope intended to create an archbishop or bishops in this country, that I had not given my consent to such an arrangement, and that, on the contrary, I should not give my consent to the appointment of any such archbishop or bishops in England. I had, indeed, been told some time before by a private individual of the Roman Catholic persuasion, that he believed there was such a project, and he asked me if I should approve of it. I said in reply that I should not approve of it. I said nothing more. I certainly concluded, weakly it may be, that the Government of Rome being a friendly Government, not being in hostility to this country, would never think it possible to create archbishops and bishops in this country, and to divide it into dioceses, without communicating at least the project to the Government of England. I did not believe that it could be intended so to insult the Queen. I may have been like the foolish Italian shepherd, who said—

“*Urben, quam dicunt Romam, Melibœe, putavi
Stultus ego huic nostræ similem.*”

I may have thought most trustingly and imprudently that the Court of Rome would observe such relations, such discretion, such courtesy in her conduct with the State of England, as all other States that are friendly observe towards each other, and as she herself has observed towards every other State in Europe. I know that in some letters of Dr. Wiseman it has, in some way, if not directly stated, been insinuated that Lord Minto, when at Rome, gave some kind of sanction or consent to the project of Rome. Lord Minto has himself given a positive denial to that statement. We have heard the story, to be sure, that at the interview with which he was honoured at the Court of Rome, the Pope, pointing to a table in the room, observed, “There is something there that regards you;” but Lord Minto did not look at the paper, or make any observation whatever on the subject. He says he does not recollect the circumstance, and it is one which he may well have forgotten, supposing it had even taken place. But, even if the story be true, it is surely a most astonishing inference to draw from the circumstance that there happened to be a paper lying on a table, which paper was never read by the Minister of England, that he had given his consent to the aggression which had been made upon this country. Be it observed, that supposing the story had been told with complete accuracy, it is not alleged that the Secretary of State, or the Pope, or any other person, said, “Here is a paper that we would wish you to take and peruse, and submit to your Government.” If anything was said at all, it was only “That is a project that concerns you.” Now, having stated this with regard to the measure that has been introduced to this country, I think it is expedient before I proceed further to state what has been the conduct of the different powers of Europe, and what has been the conduct of our own country, with respect to measures of this kind which have been attempted to be imposed upon them by the Pope of Rome. And let me first say, that I conceive it is of the nature of all ecclesiastical bodies to attempt to trench on temporal matters. I have myself resented with regard to Protestants in this country, and with regard to the Church of England herself, measures and proposals which I thought tended to give undue power to ecclesiastics with respect to the temporal affairs of the State. But, if this is true of any ecclesiastical body, it is more especially true of the Church of Rome. I conceive it to be true for two principal reasons, among others—the one, that the allowed infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church with respect to matters of spiritual doctrine gives her an influence and a power over the minds of those who belong to that communion greater than that possessed by any other Churches. But, in the next place, Rome has a traditional influence and power, a power asserted by her in the middle ages, when she often was manifesting it, perhaps in favour of civilisation or learning, or perhaps again when she was aiming by her ambition to obtain that power over kings and over States which made them entirely subject to her will. Sir, this power was asserted in the most arrogant manner by Boniface VIII., when he told Philip the Fair, of France, “It is fit you should know that you are subject to us in temporal as well as in spiritual things.” Now, the country that has had most to contest this power of the Roman Catholic Church, the country which, I should say, had most successfully contested it, but at the same time amid repeated dangers, is that very country of France. I had lately occasion to read that most able treatise upon the subject of what is called the liberties of the Gallican Church, or more properly, as the author most justly states, the liberties of the Gallican State in respect of the Church, written by M. Dupin, the President of the Legislative Assembly of France. Long before he held that post, or any public post whatever, he was distinguished for his great logical power and his great legal learning, and was regarded as an authority in all matters to which his attention had been given or his studies directed. At the beginning of his work upon the liberties of the Gallican Church he makes an observation to the effect, that though Rome has for the present relaxed many of her pretensions, she never entirely loses sight of them; that she is a power which has forgotten nothing, and learned much—that she is a power which is neither in infancy nor widowhood; hence she can struggle with temporal States at all times with means of which those temporal States often are not possessed; that therefore it requires the utmost vigilance and the utmost attention to watch against the aggressions of the Church of Rome, and to preserve

the temporal liberties of any country with which she is connected. He makes another observation, which I think may be of some use to the hon. member for Sheffield. He says that philosophy (which in this instance he thinks too presumptuous) is of opinion that there is no need of particular laws or of a study of jurisprudence on this subject—that her arm is quite sufficient to encounter any dangers to which a country may be exposed from Rome; but he goes on to say that it is quite evident that philosophers deceive themselves in this, that, though their arguments are irresistible with philosophers, yet that the great mass of men, whether from religious sanctions, whether from habit, or whether from regard to appearances in the world, are governed by religious belief, and do not attend to the opinions and arguments of philosophers. After this introduction, Dupin states, in a very small book containing an immense quantity of learning on the subject, what the assertion of the liberties of France has been in its contest with Rome. Now the cases which in connexion with France I shall mention, as well as those relating to other States, have reference entirely to the appointment to bishoprics, or other ecclesiastical offices, which were endowed, or which received salaries or emoluments from the State. I may observe, on this subject, that Mr. Bowyer dismisses all these points, and all those which refer to the time before the Reformation, as not applicable to the present state of matters. But, even supposing that they do not refer to the present state of things, there are still maxims established in law by the dicta of the great judges of France well worthy of attention. One of these is, that no document of the Pope can be received in France without the *placet*, that is, the consent or direction, of the Sovereign. This applies not only to questions relative to appointment to ecclesiastical benefices and bishoprics, but it applies generally to anything that may be ordered by the See of Rome. There is another maxim, likewise of great importance. In order to preserve the entire temporal independence of the Kings of France, it was laid down that if any person should introduce any bull or instrument inflicting spiritual excommunication or censure upon any person in the service of the Kings of France, for things done in the service of the Kings of France, all his goods and property should be forfeited to the Crown. This was a very important and striking power, but it was one rendered necessary by the assumptions of Rome in France; for it is argued justly by Dupin that if the King had all his Ministers and officers struck by excommunication he would have been made powerless, and his orders would have had no effect whatever. It was likewise held that in respect of many spiritual matters the decrees of the Pope should not be received unless confirmed by a general council. Such were the maxims and such the laws of France under the monarchy; and the powers that were exercised by the Kings of France under the monarchy were exercised by Louis IX., a saint in the Roman Catholic Church, by Henry IV., and by Louis XIV., as fully as in the other reigns and in subsequent times. But there is a circumstance which I think is worthy of mention, because it answers the argument that with respect to what is once done there can be no change or alteration made by Rome. According to the concordat made by Napoleon at the commencement of the century, appointment to a diocese was ordered by the civil Government in conjunction with the Pope; and those who, under former settlements, were legally and lawfully, according to Rome, archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in France, were entirely deprived of the rights which they possessed. Another circumstance of importance occurred to his mind on this point. In 1817 the King of France thought he would not have his country bound by the concordat made by what he considered an usurped power—the person who held the Consulate of the French Republic—and he proposed to make another concordat, to which he obtained the consent of the Pope; but when that concordat came to be considered in France, it was found that the Assembly was so averse to it, that the King asked the Pope that it should pass as not having taken place. The consequence was, that the new concordat remained a dead letter, and the former concordat was still the law, and acted upon in France. Now, do not tell me after this that the Papal power cannot retrace its steps; that what is done by Rome must for ever remain unaltered. I go next to what *was*, I am sorry to say, the law of Austria—that great Roman Catholic power. The laws which were made by the Emperor Joseph were of the most stringent description with respect to the introduction of Papal bulls and Papal appointments and censures. He declared that the civil power was supreme and sovereign—that nothing ecclesiastical could be attempted without the *placet* of the Emperor, and that no appointment could be made that had not his confirmation—that no intercourse could take place between the bishops of Austria and the Pope without the knowledge and sanction of the ruling powers; and that all Papal documents should be submitted to a mixed body of clergy and laity, and should not be valid without their concurrence. This shows, then, with regard to another great Roman Catholic power, what has been the jealousy, what has been the result of experience, with regard to the encroachments of the Church of Rome. Having stated the course pursued by these two great Roman Catholic powers, I will not go into any of the others, but state generally that there is no Roman Catholic power, so far as we have been able to ascertain, who would permit any bull to be brought into the country without the previous sanction of the civil authority. I am bound to state, however, with respect to Austria, that the Emperor has, during the year 1850, made a new constitution in respect of the clergy, and has permitted them to hold intercourse with each other and their superiors in ecclesiastical matters. As regards Portugal, I may state that our Minister there was informed by the Portuguese Minister that they would permit no bull to be sent into that country which had not previously been submitted to the Government, had thoroughly considered. We have inquired also with respect to the Protestant countries of Europe what their policy is in this matter; and we have been informed that in Prussia—the greatest of these powers—though, with reference to her Catholic population, she acts by agree-

ment with the Pope in the appointment of bishops and clergy—yet, when it was proposed at Rome that a Bishop of Magdeburg should be created in Prussia, that country immediately referred to the articles of the Treaty of Westphalia, and refused her consent to the introduction of such a bishopric. There was an agreement made twenty years ago between the King of the Netherlands with respect to the appointment of bishops in some cases in Holland by means of a concordat, but the measure excited so much indignation in Holland that it has never been carried into effect. From what I have said, the inference may be drawn that there is no country in Europe, however great or however small, no country which values its own independence, upon which the Pope would have attempted to pass this insult which he has offered to the kingdom of England. In some instances the matter is regulated by treaty between the two powers; in other instances it has been proposed to introduce bishops into Protestant countries, and, when it has been refused, the Court of Rome has at once desisted from its intention. I come now to consider what is the character of the insult that has been offered to this country. The document by which the recent change was proposed to be effected was purposely issued without the smallest reference to the United Kingdom being an independent State. It is not made a question, from the beginning to the end, whether there can be any power existing in this country, the consent of which ought to be asked, or whose lawful power ought to be respected. An archbishop is pretended to be appointed to this metropolitan city, where the Queen holds her Court, and where she meets her Parliament. Then other sees are pretended to be created in various parts of the country which are now under the established bishops of the Church of England. The document issued with reference to the appointment of Dr. Wiseman declares at once—"We govern, and shall continue to govern, the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex." And in the case of five other counties the same pretensions were set forth. Now, sir, I cannot see in these words anything but an assumption of territorial sovereignty. It is not a direction that certain persons should govern those who belong to the Roman Catholic communion situated within a certain district, and that over them alone they were to exercise their spiritual functions. Those English counties are territories subject to the Queen's dominion, and the only excuse that is offered for the assumption of Rome is that there are certain forms belonging to all documents, and that it is according to the forms of the Church of Rome that the assumption of dominion over Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex, belongs to the agent who has been sent there. That may be; I do not deny their knowledge of their own forms, but there is another form with which I have been acquainted. It is, "Victoria, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen." That form appears to me totally inconsistent with the other. Take which of them you like. Say that the Pope is to be Sovereign in this country, and that any person he chooses to send is to govern the English counties, and that Royalty is bound to pay obedience to the orders of the Court of Rome. That is one course. But I cannot conceive that any person who is bound in loyalty to Queen Victoria can admit that any authority but her own can govern those counties. Well, then, I know not well what these gentlemen mean; but if they mean to say that this is an authority merely assumed, and that it cannot be enforced, I certainly know that perfectly well. I owe very little gratitude or thanks to those who do not attempt to enforce that authority, because I know it is impossible. It is enough for me that here is the assumption of a power. If a person had come during the time that the Pretender resided at Rome, and said, "I have been named Lord-Lieutenant of Middlesex by James Stuart, and claim to govern the county of Middlesex by virtue of that authority," I know perfectly well that the King of England's Lord-Lieutenant would have held his authority unscathed, and that he would have been obeyed: still I should have said that that was an unwarrantable assumption, and one that justly subjected the person so assuming it to any penalty which he might thereby have incurred. I must now refer for a few minutes to that which has been done in former times in this very country—and that in Roman Catholic times—with respect to the power of the Pope of Rome. I find that in those times our Catholic ancestors were as jealous as we can be in these days of the encroaching power of the Pope. I find even in the days of William the Conqueror that the Sovereign would not allow any sentence of excommunication to be proceeded with in this country without his authority. I find that in the time of Edward I. a person who had procured an excommunication against another person was proceeded against in the King's courts, that the judges declared that his procuring that excommunication without the assent of the King was no less than high-treason, and that it was only on the supplication of his councillors that the King refrained from having that very sentence executed. Now, those persons who were thus concerned in carrying on that trial, and in condemning that person, were no Protestants, or men distrustful of the Roman Catholic faith, or in any way opposed to the Roman Catholic tenets. On the contrary, they were all strict adherents of the Roman Catholic faith; but, nevertheless, they would not allow any usurped power to come into England. So likewise in the time of Edward III. a petition was presented to the Crown to prevent any letters, bulls, process, reservations, instruments, or any other things whatsoever, being received in this country from Rome, to the prejudice of the King and of his people. Now, be it observed, this is not, as Mr. Bowyer says, entirely confined to endowments which were then protected by the State, but this refers to all those relations between man and man with which the spiritual power of Rome was in the habit of interfering, and of controlling; and it was for this purpose, therefore, that our Catholic ancestors thought it necessary to take measures to guard against the power of Rome. The statutes upon that subject are well known, and have been frequently quoted, more especially the statute of "provisos" and the statute of *promunire*, which was passed in the reign of Richard II. I shall not trouble the House by stating the

particular nature of those measures. I merely refer to the subject to show that in those times there was a very constant, vigilant, and, I believe, very wise jealousy entertained with respect to the power of Rome. I will now proceed to the consideration of the course which the Government took upon being made aware of the publication of these letters apostolic, and to state the nature of the measure which I propose to introduce. The first step the Government took upon having their attention drawn to these letters was to ask the law-officers of the Crown whether they came under any known law, and what, in their opinion, would be the effect of a prosecution against those who had introduced those letters into this country? The opinion which was given by the law-officers to the Government was to the effect (without quoting the words) that with regard to the assumption of the particular titles assumed, and with reference to the present state of the law and the existing statutes, they did not think that either by the common law, or the statute law, that assumption of those titles was illegal, or that those persons who assumed them could be prosecuted with effect. But with respect to a further question, they said that the introduction of letters apostolic into this country was, in their opinion, an offence—an offence which could be prosecuted; that, in their opinion, the judge would declare that the introduction of those letters apostolic was unlawful, and was subject to a penalty; but they said (giving undoubtedly the mere law of the case), that the statute which prohibited the introduction of any bull or writings from Rome had not been for a very long period of time put in force: and that if the Government proposed to prosecute the offence of assuming those titles on the ground that it was the introduction of bulls, or writings, or letters from Rome, they thought that the fact of the long disuse of any prosecution for such an offence would probably cause such a prosecution to fail. I think that the House will agree that, with such an opinion before us, it was not advisable for the Government to desire the law-officers to institute a prosecution, by which the authority of the Government might be greatly weakened, and no useful effect be produced. But I will say, further, that on this, the first occasion when we thought we had reason to complain of the introduction of documents of this description, I should with very great reluctance have ordered the prosecution of that, without notice, which had been so long done, and which had been practised without let or hindrance, and apparently with the tacit consent of the Government of this country. There is a passage which no doubt is not strict law, but which appears to me to be sound morality on this subject, which I have met with in the writings of Jeremy Taylor, who observes,—

“As long as the law is obligatory, so long our obedience is due, and he that begins a contrary custom, without reason, sins; but he that breaks the law when the custom is entered and fixed is excused, because it is supposed the legislative power consents when, by not punishing, it suffers disobedience to grow to a custom.”

I think that sentence in a great degree applicable to the custom I have mentioned. But there is a further difficulty; and I wish to state to the House the whole of the difficulties upon the subject with regard to the statute for preventing bulls or writings being introduced into this country. No doubt that, according to the statute of Richard II., in certain cases the introduction of bulls, and the assumption of power by virtue of such bulls, would be a very great offence, and would subject the offenders to the loss of their property. That was decided in the case of Lalor, in the time of James I. Lalor having obtained writings from Rome, as vicar-apostolic, was desirous of exercising, and did exercise, jurisdiction in various cases by virtue of the power given to him by those writings. There is likewise a statutory prohibition, which was passed in the 13th of Elizabeth, and which states the law as it now stands with respect to the introduction of writings from Rome. In the year 1846 that part of the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth which attached the punishment of treason to any offence of that nature was taken away, but it was declared that in taking away the penalty there was nothing in that relaxation of the law which should render it lawful to introduce such bulls or such writings. We might therefore have prosecuted, but with the prospect of such an issue as I have stated, under the statute to which I have just referred. But then, a further question arises—if these statutes had, to a certain degree, fallen into disuse, would it or would it not be advisable to make a new enactment upon the subject with regard to the introduction of writings from Rome? Now, this is an important part of that great subject to which the hon. member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) referred the other night. It appears to me that if you alter the law you should do so in one of two ways. Either you should bring in a law containing a general prohibition, such as is contained in the statute of Edward III., and such as exists in the laws of some countries in Europe, enacting that no bull or writing should be introduced that was prejudicial to the King or to the welfare of his people—that would be one course; but the adoption of such a course would, I think, leave the law exceedingly vague, and it would always be doubtful whether or not any particular bull or writing fell within that particular prohibition; or you might adopt another course, and one which, I believe, has been very generally adopted by countries on the continent of Europe. It is that of declaring that every bull and every writing coming from Rome should be subjected to some civil authority, and should not have currency, or be allowed to be of force, without the sanction of such authority, or without the omission of any objection to it. Now, sir, I do not say that there is any such paramount objection as should prevent the Legislature from adopting a measure of that kind, but at the same time, I cannot but conceive that there might be many great grievances attending it. It cannot be denied that the local discipline of the Roman Catholic Church and its internal concerns cannot be regulated without the introduction of a certain class of bulls, of dispensations, and writings from Rome. Again, there are

writings of a description which some persons may consider would be dangerous to the State, and be an undue interference with the temporal concerns of the people, but which others might consider (although not for a moment friendly to their introduction) to come entirely within the scope of the free exercise of religious communication between the head of the Roman Catholic Church and those belonging to that community. I cannot but think that if any discretion were lodged in the office of the Secretary of State, or in the hands of a board, upon this subject, we should bring into very frequent discussion the propriety of allowing papers from the Church of Rome to be published. In many instances it would, no doubt, be thought that the Secretary of State had dealt unfairly and harshly by the Roman Catholic body, while, in other instances, it would be said that he had allowed writings prejudicial to the State to be published. Now, in this free country, and in this free Parliament, these and other questions would become matters of debate and party dispute. It would, in my opinion, be a very great evil to introduce such additional and irritating topics into our Parliamentary discussions. Therefore, sir, after much deliberation on this subject, and after a very anxious discussion with a view to come to the best decision that could be formed upon this subject, we have thought it best neither to propose the repeal of the statute which I have mentioned, nor to propose either of such substitute alternatives as those to which I have alluded. In the present state of affairs, with the great uncertainty which still prevails as to what was the intention of the measure that has been taken by Rome, whether it is the prelude to further measures, or whether it is merely a blunder committed on the sudden which will be retracted or amended—in this state of uncertainty I think it far better on the one side not to relax any power which you can now maintain by law, and on the other not to propose any substitute which would of itself be the cause of further debate. I come, then, to the immediate question of the assumption of titles, and I think it is useful upon this subject to refer to that which was declared as the reason of a clause which is now contained in the Roman Catholic Relief Act. Sir R. Peel, in introducing that great measure, spoke to the following effect:—

“A practice has occasionally, of late, prevailed in Ireland, which is calculated to afford great, and I may add just, offence to Protestants—I allude to the practice of claiming and assuming, on the part of the Roman Catholic prelates, the names and titles of dignities belonging to the Church of England. I propose that the episcopal titles and names made use of in the Church of England shall not be assumed by bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. Bishops I call them, for bishops they are, and have, among other privileges, a right to exercise the power of ordination, which is perfectly valid, and is even recognised by our own Church; but I maintain it is not seemly or decorous for them to use the styles and titles that properly belong to prelates of the Established Church, much less publicly and ostentatiously to assume them, as of late. This will be prevented in future.”

Accordingly, that provision was inserted in the act, and I find that in the following year there was a pastoral address from the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops to the clergy and laity belonging to their community throughout Ireland. This address spoke in very warm terms of the kindness which the Legislature had shown in passing that act. It is worth while at the present time, when the language which has been used by Archbishop Cullen is not quite so respectful to the Legislature and to the Sovereign of this country, to recall a little to mind what was the universal sentiment of 26 archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in the year 1829. After saying that—

“The storm which almost wrecked the country has subsided, whilst social order, with peace and justice in her train, prepares to establish her sway in this long-distracted country”—they go on to say—

“And is not the King, beloved brethren, whom by the law of God we are bound to honour, entitled now to all the honour, and all the obedience, and all the gratitude, you can bestow? And do not his Ministers merit from you a confidence commensurate with the labours and the zeal expended by them on your behalf? And that Legislature which raised you up from your prostrate condition, and gave to you, without reserve, all the privileges you desired—is not that Legislature entitled to your reverence and love? We confide that your feelings on this subject are in unison with our own, and that a steady attachment to the constitution and laws of your country, as well as to the person and Government of our most gracious Sovereign, will be manifested in your entire conduct.”

I think, so far as these questions are concerned, it would be well for Archbishop Cullen and Archbishop M'Hale to refer to what were the sentiments then expressed by their predecessors the Catholic archbishops and bishops of Ireland, what was the loyalty they expressed to the Crown, and what was the attachment they expressed to the constitution; and to consider whether such conduct is not worthy of imitation. But they do not pass without notice the clause to which I have alluded, but they refer to it in this manner:—

“We rejoice at the result, regardless of those provisions in the great measure of relief which injuriously affect ourselves, and not only us but those religious orders which the Church of God, even from the apostolic times, has nurtured and cherished in her bosom. These provisions, however, which were, as we hope and believe, a sacrifice required, not by reason or policy, but by prejudices holding captive the minds of even honest men, did not prevent us from rejoicing at the good which was effected for our country.”

They did not therefore, while referring to those provisions, ask for their repeal, or do anything more than give expression to a passing regret that such a clause should have been introduced. It seems to me therefore, if such were the provisions of the Relief Act, if those provisions were passed without objection on the part of the Roman Catholics themselves, if they were received

with that submission and obedience by the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland, that we certainly should be fully justified in proposing provisions of a similar nature with regard to the recent assumption of titles in this country. For I consider that whether the assumption be that of the title of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the jurisdiction and authority possessed over every part of the archdiocese of Canterbury, or whether it be that of Archbishop of Westminster, with a new diocese carved out of that which is under its present Protestant bishop, is immaterial to the question: that it is an assumption of supremacy and of sovereignty which ought not to have been committed by the Pope of Rome cannot be denied. But there are other questions which are closely and immediately connected with the assumption of these titles. It is believed, and I think not without foundation, that one reason for the change from vicars-apostolic, under which titles the Roman Catholics have enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, and with which for two hundred years they have been satisfied, and to make them bishops with a new division of the country, is not merely to place them in the same degree with the Protestant bishops, but it is also for the purpose of enabling them to exercise, by the authority of those names, a greater control over all the endowments which are in the hands of certain Roman Catholics as trustees in this country. I don't think it would be fitting that we should allow that control to be exercised by virtue of any of those titles which we propose to prohibit. If, therefore, the House should give me leave to bring in a bill upon this subject, I propose to introduce a clause which shall enact that all gifts to persons under those titles shall be null and void, that any act done by them with those titles shall be null and void, and that property bequeathed or given for such purposes shall pass at once to the Crown, with power to the Crown either to create a trust for purposes similar to those for which the original trust had been created, or for other purposes, as shall seem best to the Crown. I do not think a power less extensive than that would enable us to reach the justice of the case. I am aware that in several cases there has been a transfer of property from those who have hitherto held it to other persons who have been named by authority either from Rome or by persons assuming to act as bishops under the See of Rome. I was told the other day that a priest living near the sea-coast was deprived of an income which he had hitherto held, being informed by ecclesiastical authority that it was found that such property, and such an income, could be more usefully employed for other purposes. Now, I think we should do all in our power to defend the Roman Catholic laity against such acts of usurpation. The clause which I propose to introduce will, in a great degree, do so. If it should be necessary to introduce other provisions for this purpose in the bill that my hon. and learned friend the Attorney-General will introduce with regard to charitable trusts, it can be done, and further security can be taken to guard the Catholic laity from that which purports to be a transfer of their property to hands which were not intended, nor had any right to be possessed of it. There is a more difficult question, which perhaps the hon. member for Youghal may raise with regard to the means by which the transfer of this property is obtained—those means being a spiritual censure against the priests of the Roman Catholic community. That is a far more difficult question, and one which can hardly be reached unless by the spirit of some of those ancient laws to which I have referred. In the present bill I do not propose to introduce any provision of the kind contained in those laws. What I propose is, in the first place, to prevent the assumption of any title taken, not only from any diocese now existing, but from any territory or any place within any part of the United Kingdom. That provision is in conformity with a proposition which was made by the Bishop of London, in answer to one of the addresses which was presented to him. He said that he thought that not only we ought to prohibit the assumption of any title or rank already existing in this country, but any title derived from any place in the United Kingdom. Therefore I have agreed with that suggestion. Perhaps I may mention that when I informed the Archbishop of Canterbury that it was not intended to institute a prosecution, he said, "I did not expect that the Government would institute a prosecution, but what I do expect is, that some legislation should take place upon this subject." I think, therefore, in this respect we prevent that which I consider to be an insult to the Crown of this country, an interference with the rights of the Established Church of this country, and an attack upon the independence of this nation. By the other clauses to which I have alluded I think we shall obtain security against any person obtaining possession under these titles of any trust property to which I have referred. I have now stated the effect of the bill that I propose to introduce. It is, as the House will see, entirely different from a proposal for a new system with regard to the relation between the See of Rome and this country. I think, whatever may be our ultimate legislation upon this great subject, a subject far greater than that to which I propose the present bill to relate, we are not now in a condition to frame any such measure. Much will depend upon the temper in which the present measure may be regarded by Rome, and much upon the direction which may be given to him who has taken upon himself the responsibility of representing at Rome the opinions of the Roman Catholic clergy, and of inducing the Pope to assent to the issuing of this document. That individual has it in his own power to remove a great part of the objections which have been felt in this country. If he has been given by the Pope a title which belongs to the Government of Rome to confer, and has been honoured by an election which has placed him in the band of the Sacred College, I should think that if he has any regard for the welfare of this country—if he has any regard for the peace and stability of the Roman Catholic community—the best course he can take will be to renounce the title which he has assumed in this country, and rather do that which I believe it was his original intention to do, and which he assured me it was his original intention to do—namely, reside at Rome. [Dr. Wiseman was present under the gallery.] Bu

if other counsels should prevail, and if he should be able to instil notions of conquest, of ambition, or of revenge, into the Court of Rome, we may then, probably (though we can well know the end), look for a long and arduous struggle. With respect to that struggle, the part which I shall take will be guided by that principle which has hitherto always guided my conduct on this subject. I am for the fullest enjoyment of religious liberty; but I am entirely opposed to any interference on the part of ecclesiastics with the temporal supremacy of the realm. Whenever I have seen in other bodies, whenever I have seen in my own Church a disposition to assume powers which I thought were inconsistent with the temporal supremacy that belonged to the State, I have not been slow in urging myself, and inducing others to urge, strong and prevailing objections to any such measure. I may perhaps say that in the course of the very last year, when the proposal was made—which was plausible in itself—to give to the bishops of the English Church a power which I thought would give them a control over the temporal existence and well-being and property of the clergy of the Church, that proposal, because I saw in it a dangerous principle, was resisted, and successfully resisted, by my colleagues, in the place where it was proposed. But, if that is the case with regard to Protestants who have expressed the utmost attachment to freedom, if that is the case with regard to a Church which, like the Church of England is, I believe, of all established Churches the most tolerant of the difference of opinion, the most consonant with the freedom of the institutions of a country like this—if that is the case, shall I not far more strongly object to any attempt on the part of the Church of Rome to introduce her temporal supremacy into this country? I cannot, sir, forget that not alone in ancient times, but in the most recent times, opinions have been put forth on the part of that Church totally abhorrent to our notions of freedom, civil or religious. It was a very recent Pope who said “that from the foul spring of indifference had sprung that absurd, and bold, and mad opinion that freedom of conscience would be permitted and guaranteed to all persons in the State.” It is quite as recently that there has been kept up in the Court of Rome a prohibition to study such works as those of Guicciardini, De Thou, Arnaud, Robertson, and even among others there was to be found the Greek Lexicon of Scapula as a fit work to be prohibited from being read. When I see in those times so great an aversion to religious liberty; when I see so determined a watch over books which contain, not merely questions of doctrine, but which contain narratives that may be injurious to the reputations of Popes, I own I feel a still greater dislike to the introduction of ultramontane Romanist opinions into this country. I see, as I stated the other night, a total and entire distinction between the faith of the Roman Catholics as practised by the great men of the time of our forefathers—as practised and believed by the eminent men who lived in France, and who were the distinguished ornaments of the Roman Catholic faith and of the bar—there is, I say, a total and entire distinction between the faith of such men and the ultramontane doctrines, as they are properly called by the Duke of Norfolk, which are brought to us from the Court of Rome. In admitting, therefore, full liberty of opinion to the Roman Catholics, I propose that this House now—and, if it should be necessary, on future occasions—should resist the exercise of that power. I know, sir, that in taking this course we are liable to be misrepresented, and having stood during a long contest exposed to popular odium, and exposed to exclusion from power on behalf of the privileges of the Roman Catholics, I know it may be said we are now changing our opinions and altering our views with respect to the Roman Catholics. But I do not feel, sir, I have changed at all those opinions I have held, that Roman Catholics were entitled to be admitted to all the privileges of the constitution. My belief is that those acts, as tests of exclusion which were passed in the reign of Charles II. and James II. were only rightly enacted because there was then, and very justly, a suspicion of Charles II. and James II. as Sovereigns upon the throne, that if they were allowed to employ Roman Catholics in the service of the Crown, not only the loyal Roman Catholics would be employed, but loyal Protestants would be excluded. That, I think, was the ground for the acts then enforced; and, be it observed, that in the time of Elizabeth, when you could trust the Sovereign on the throne as you can do now, as being animated with feelings for the defence of the Protestant faith, no such exclusive legislation was necessary. I believe our powers at the present moment are augmented, because loyal Roman Catholics, attached to the Crown, attached to the constitution of this country, can hold office, and can be admitted to seats in the Legislature. I feel we are too much more powerful in entering upon this contest, because we have it to say that we have made no exclusion on the ground of religion, and that if we make any exclusion, it is in defence of the laws and of the authority of the constitution. Sir, I think, therefore, with those feelings, we may say, as the Parliament in old times, as the Parliament in Roman Catholic times said, that if we admit those assumptions,

“So that the Crown of England, which hath been so free at all times that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God, in all things touching the regality of the same Crown, and to none other, should be submitted to the Pope, and the laws and statutes of the realm by him defeated and annulled at his will, in perpetual distraction of the sovereignty of the King our lord, his crown and his regality, and of all his realm, which God forbid!”

—sir, the Parliament, the Roman Catholic Parliament of that day, declared—

“That they will stand with the same crown and regality, in those cases specially, and in all other cases which shall be attempted against the said crown and regality, in all points, with all their power.”

So say I; let us, too, stand against those attempts in all points and with all our power.

The noble lord then moved for leave to bring in the bill. On the question being put,

Mr. ROEBUCK rose, but was for some moments inaudible, owing to the noise of members

leaving the House. He proceeded to say, the noble lord began by laying a foundation broad enough for the large capital of legislation proposed by the hon. member for Buckingham. He not only went back to the most distant ages, but had searched Europe through, and had gone through the history of Austria, of Russia, of France, and of Holland for his act, and, lastly, of England. If he had gathered its purpose rightly from the noble lord's description, the bill to be introduced meant that bishops of the Roman Catholic faith should not call themselves bishops of any place in the three kingdoms, or in any part of her Majesty's dominions [Lord J. RUSSELL: "No; only in the three kingdoms"]; and that any property left to them as such bishops should be forfeited to the Crown. Thus, he supposed, if a Roman Catholic were to call himself Archbishop of Westminster he would be subject to the penalties of the law; but, if he were to call himself Archbishop *in* Westminster, the law would be inoperative. That was the whole sum of the measure. With all the substructure laid down by the noble lord he entirely concurred. There was no strong opinion with respect to ecclesiastical power and ambition to which the noble lord had given utterance in which he (Mr. Roebuck) did not agree; but there was one broad fallacy running through every argument he had used. The noble lord had all along applied himself to countries in which the Roman Catholic religion was established, but there was one country where the Roman Catholic religion stood in such a relation to the State that the law did not lend its peculiar tenets any assistance. It was, like ourselves, governed by a constitution springing from a deeply-laid faith, and imbued with all the Puritan spirit which distinguished us in 1640, and yet that country looked on a Roman Catholic just as she did on an Episcopalian, or on the professor of any other religion. It was not a country on which you could look with disrespect; it was a country of 25,000,000 people speaking our language. It was not afraid of the Pope, and it was a gross omission on the part of the noble lord to avoid the only case which bore any similarity to our own. Could one thing be more widely distinguished from another than France from England, or than Catholic England from Protestant England? The law of France, of Austria, and of Prussia was right, for these reasons—that the Catholic religion established by law contemplated the power of the Pope and the Pope's infallibility as an essential element of their faith; and, as to the quotations made by the noble lord from M. Dupin, any one who had read Pascal or Arnaud must have known that in the struggle for Gallican liberty it was necessary for them to protest against the assumptions of the Pope, and to resist, because if they had not so protested his acts would have become the law of the land. The reason for these precautions ceased when the country ceased to be Catholic. The noble lord had declared the Pope's proceedings to be an insult to England, and an encroachment on the prerogatives of the Crown, and on the rights and liberties of Englishmen. His bill therefore had for its object to defend the Queen's prerogative, to wipe away the insult, and to maintain the liberty and independence of the country. The noble lord complained that the Pope had not put himself in communication with the Government of Great Britain and with the Government of Ireland. If he (Mr. Roebuck) had been Lord-Lieutenant, and a Catholic bishop had applied to him for advice, he would have said he looked on him precisely in the same light as a Wesleyan priest, that he might do as he liked, but that he, the Lord-Lieutenant, knew him not, that he might be cardinal or archbishop, but he had no power under the law, and was not recognised by it. Had Cardinal Wiseman been so treated, would England have been less free? When the noble lord talked of the conduct of our ancestors, he would say that, when the Pope was indeed a power, and could make England and the monarch on the throne tremble, it was necessary, and it was glorious, to see Parliament stand up against his power; but now that he was supported by French bayonets, that he was in such a state that England might go far by negotiations to have that small army recalled, and then the Pope would be a vagabond on the face of the earth—(a laugh)—he did not use the word disrespectfully, he meant merely a man wandering about the world—it was to him surprising that the noble lord should have thought fit to introduce his bill to meet a thing which at this time of day ought to be met with ridicule and by instructing the people. Let them depend on it, the act would only rivet the yoke they sought to remove, and would tend to make men's minds more obedient to it. It was all very well to say that if a man pronounced an excommunication or published a bull he should be punishable by law, but let them follow one step further. Suppose the priest who had excommunicated was punished by law, and then said, "I will not absolve,"—what were you to do? He (Mr. Roebuck) would accept the very case of Sardinia, quoted by the noble lord, as an illustration, though it was a Catholic country, of the source whence the power of the priest was derived. Was it from the law? No; but it was from the power the priest had over the weak, miserable mind of the poor man, and over the minds of his family and friends, who believed the priest had the power to consign them to damnation. You could not reach that power by Act of Parliament. You might print book after book, you might pronounce anathema after anathema, but you could not relieve the poor man from this fear in his mind, and it was the power the priest had which gave him real power, and not the operation of the law. If they said they would make a law to prevent persons on their death-beds leaving property to priests and bishops he would be the very first to assist them, but he would extend it to all alike. He should fear a Methodist preacher as much as Cardinal Wiseman—he should fear the Bishop of London quite as much as Cardinal Wiseman. He would direct an act against them by the general name of "priests," but he would not direct any against a Catholic bishop which he did not apply to a Methodist preacher. Did the noble lord know what he was about? Had there not been for the last half dozen years a constant acknowledgment of the Catholic bishops in Ireland by the names of their sees; and, not only that, but had not the Charitable Bequests Act expressly appointed a com-

mission partly composed of Catholic bishops, and had not a commission issued from the Sovereign naming those bishops by the titles of their sees? Had not bishops been named by persons in authority by the names of the sees in which they resided, and were they not recognised in Acts of Parliament by those names? Why, there was a very stringent act, which rendered it necessary to record the name of every Catholic priest, and the name of the person from whom he derived his orders, and table after table had been filled up under it, naming the various Catholic bishops by the names of their sees. His objection to this measure was, that it was a step backward in obedience to prejudice out of doors—that it was a retrograde step, made because of the feeling of hon. gentlemen opposite. The noble lord could not be alarmed at the power of the Pope in this country unless he was alarmed at the influence of the priesthood on account of their intelligence, industry, and continued application to the principles of religion. There was something in the circumstances of a Catholic priest coming into this country which exhibited him in an exalted position. He came into a kingdom where he had to meet great prejudice, among a people full of distrust and predisposition to suspect him; and there, though protected by the law, he made no converts but by the influence of his mind over the minds of others, and could derive no power but from his own industry. It was dangerous to meddle with such a power, and all he would say of the noble lord's law was, that it derived its benefit from its utter inefficiency. The noble lord had thought fit to warn him not to have faith in what was called philosophy. If not, he wanted to know in what he was to have faith; for, in his sense of the term, to have faith in philosophy meant to have faith in the strength of truth. If he was not to believe in philosophy, he had against the Roman Catholic priest no defence whatever. If the noble lord said there should be no Catholic bishop, he impugned the freedom of the Roman Catholics, and said they should not have the comforts of their religion; but if he meant they should not be called bishops of any particular place within the realm, he (Mr. Roebuck) would not divide against it, because he considered the measure utterly unworthy of a moment's consideration; and looked on the noble lord as having, in vulgar phrase, "thrown out a tub to the whale." The description which the noble lord at first gave of what was necessary to be done somewhat staggered him; for he thought the noble lord was about to yield to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and to deal with the question in a way that would be satisfactory to them. No such thing. The noble lord simply yielded to the vanity of certain persons; and if the Roman Catholics would follow his advice they would say, "We do not care about calling our archbishop the Archbishop of Westminster—we will give him some other name; he will still derive his power from the Pope, and after your bill passes he will have exactly the same diocese, exactly the same power, and he will deal with the property which you seek to protect just as he would have done had it never been proposed." Suppose that, instead of calling himself Archbishop of Westminster, he were to call himself Archbishop *in* Westminster. Your Act of Parliament then would not touch him. But if the act should be framed to meet that case, he might call himself bishop of any foreign district, with power in Westminster (so we understood the hon. member, but he spoke throughout in a very low tone, and was occasionally altogether inaudible). How would you get out of that? How, too, would you frame an indictment under the act? and if it were in Ireland, how would you try it? It was extraordinary that the noble lord had carefully avoided giving any explanation of the machinery of the bill. The noble lord said it was an offence for a Roman Catholic prelate to call himself Archbishop of Westminster, but he had not stated whether it was to be a misdemeanour or a felony—whether it was to be punished by imprisonment or fine—nor had he declared how he was to be tried. Was there ever such a meagre finale to such an overgrown commencement? The noble lord might as well have said at the outset that all he proposed to do was to prevent Roman Catholic prelates from using certain titles, and there an end. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam had called himself so for many years. Suppose he and his brother prelates were to say, "We have enjoyed our titles for a long time, and we will not surrender them at your bidding; we will resist and test your law and your machinery for enforcing it." Suppose the Archbishop of Tuam were to write a letter to the Lord-Lieutenant, signed by his title, and say that he did so on purpose, in order to try the law. How would you deal with that case in a country where nine persons out of ten were Catholics? The bill would, he feared, be productive of mischief, not advantage—it would cause excitement, not allay it. Carrying out his hypothetical case, he would suppose that the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland took up the gauntlet which the Archbishop of Tuam threw down. An indictment would, he presumed, be sent before the grand jury, and then remitted to a special jury. Conceive the state of things in the archbishop's diocese while the matter was pending. Remember you had to deal with an excitable, a strongly religious, and he would say a prejudiced people, over whom the archbishop exercised a power which to us was unknown. His influence was great over the minds of the people, not only of his own diocese, but of the whole of Ireland. Should the Government venture to imprison a person who was sacred in the eyes of the people of Ireland, they would endanger the peace of the whole country. And why was this hazard to be run? Here was England, whose fleets could sweep the seas, declaring herself insulted because one priest chooses to call another by a long name, and to tell him that he had power and jurisdiction over certain counties in England! And the noble lord spoke of this proceeding as if it took away power and jurisdiction from somebody else. Was the Archbishop of Canterbury one bit the weaker because Archbishop Wiseman existed? Had his temporalities been touched? Had his spiritual power in his diocese been diminished? Was he not still the Primate of the Church of England? Then, if the Archbishop of Westminster had not been hurt by the act of the Pope, had the Queen been hurt? Was not Cardinal

Wiseman, although he called himself Archbishop of Westminster, just as much the Queen's subject as before? Could he do anything now which he could not do before? and if he should do anything unlawful could he not be punished for it? There might be cause for dissatisfaction if the Catholic bishops were established here in connexion with the State, as they were in some of the colonies; but as long as the Roman Catholic system was a voluntary one, we had no more cause to meddle with it than with a private club. If we allowed the Catholics to manage their own affairs as they pleased, no danger would accrue. This reminded him of something he had heard about Lord Minto, which he would take the opportunity of repeating in the presence of a Cabinet Minister. He was informed that Lord Minto had received a letter from the Abbate Hamilton, a Scotchman, and a convert to the Roman Catholic religion, whom he knew at Rome, to this effect:—The Abbate Hamilton said that Lord Minto, coming direct from an audience with the Pope, told him that he had seen a brief by which the hierarchy of the Roman Church was established in England. Lord Minto said that the Pope had shown him the document, but he (Lord Minto) told him that he had nothing to do with it, because with the internal regulations of the Church of Rome the British Government had nothing to do. That was the language used by Lord Minto to Abbate Hamilton, who, since the outburst of puritanical spirit in this country, had written to Lord Minto to recall the remarkable circumstance to his recollection. To return to the question, he appealed to the justice of the House, and asked whether the whole conduct of the noble lord at the head of the Government had not tended to induce a belief in the minds of the Catholics of this country that what was about to be done would give no offence. It was useless for the noble lord to accuse him of misrepresenting him, and to refer to his past career when he (Mr. Roebuck) pointed to his present acts. It was just as if a person convicted of picking a pocket should allege that he had borne a good character for twenty years. In such a case the judge would say, "More shame for you;" and so he said to the noble lord. When the noble lord turned round upon him with his overwhelming sarcasm, and said that he ought to have credit given him for good intentions, he would remind the noble lord of the old proverb, which said that hell was paved with good intentions. A few years hence the noble lord would bitterly regret that he had yielded himself up, heart and mind, to the control of an ignorant multitude, and prepared an Act of Parliament founded on feelings of bigotry.

Mr. J. O'CONNELL said that he would not address a bitter word to the noble lord, although he could not divest himself of a bitter feeling caused by the noble lord's exciting the bigotry that had disgraced this country during the last few months. Although the noble lord had proved false to his name, he had on the present occasion done wisely, and even courageously, in preparing to undergo the ridicule which would be heaped upon him for having brought forth this mouse out of a mountain rather than propose a severe penal enactment. Of the noble lord's bill itself he would say very little. The noble lord, however, at the commencement of his speech, spoke of the Primate of all Ireland, the Rev. Dr. Cullen, as an ecclesiastic who was utterly unacquainted with that country. Dr. Cullen was for many years the representative of the Irish bishops at Rome, and in that position he was necessarily acquainted with every detail of the Catholic Church in Ireland. At the period of Doctor Cullen's appointment, the intrigues of the British Government had been most successful in introducing division into the ranks of the Irish Church, and this division was very strongly manifested on the occasion of the election made by the parish priests of the diocese of Armagh. The Pope, to avoid giving a triumph to either party, appointed Dr. Cullen to the vacant see. The noble lord thought that Dr. Cullen ought to have consulted the Irish Government; but he (Mr. J. O'Connell) thought that he was under no obligation to take that course. The Government brought forward the scheme of the Irish colleges without consulting any of the Catholic prelates, and that was no inducement to Dr. Cullen to go out of his way to consult the Government. The noble lord had blamed the Synod of Thurles for having dared to express their opinion on the education question; but the fact was, that by their oaths as bishops they were compelled to express their opinion on that subject, and they did no more than express their opinion. They sought no endowments for themselves, they sought no monopoly in the appointments to the colleges. All that they asked for was a guarantee of the orthodoxy of the teachers in those colleges, so that they might be assured that no infidel doctrines would be taught to the Catholic youth under their care. The noble lord had also accused the Synod of Thurles of interfering with the question of occupancy of land in Ireland. They did no such thing. They merely deplored the ruthless acts which had been committed by Catholic as well as Protestant landlords, and expressed their deep sympathy with the people under the miseries to which they had been exposed; and he maintained that they could not have done less in the discharge of their sacred duty. The noble lord had referred to various instances of Romish aggression, but he had not been fortunate in the instances he had taken. With regard to Sardinia, he had mis-stated everything, and had totally omitted to mention the bad faith of the Sardinian Government towards the Court of Rome. In 1841, a treaty was solemnly entered into between the Sardinian Government and the Court of Rome, abrogating certain immunities and privileges of the Catholic Church in Sardinia. In 1848, the Sardinian Government came forward with another proposition, still further abrogating the immunities of the Church. The Court of Rome met it with a counter proposition, and it was expected that some arrangement would soon be come to between the two Courts, when suddenly the Sardinian Ambassador was withdrawn from Rome, and the Sardinian Government, of its own accord, abrogated the entire immunities of the Church, without any further consultation with Rome, and without having obtained its consent. He assured the noble lord that the Sicardi laws went much

further than he seemed to suppose; that they trenched upon purely ecclesiastical matters, such as the holydays of the Church, and the like. The censures of the Church were necessarily incurred by those Catholics who had taken part in the passing of these measures. When the unfortunate Minister Rosas was on his deathbed his confessor refused to give him absolution until he had made reparation for the injury he had done. The dying man did make a retraction privately, and he thereupon received the sacrament of absolution; but, having subsequently refused to allow his retraction to be published, the clergyman who attended him was obliged to refuse him the last sacrament of the Church, the *viaticum*. The Archbishop of Turin, however, in consideration of his having received absolution, allowed the Catholic rites of burial to be performed over his remains. That was the whole case. The noble lord was not more fortunate in his reference to France, whose wide-spread immorality and infidelity did not say much for the tampering of the State with the Church. The noble lord also spoke of Austria, and expressed his regret at the restrictions which had been imposed upon the Church by the infidel Emperor Joseph. Those restrictions had been found so injurious that the present Emperor, finding that the Catholic religion had been the real bond of order in the late convulsions and struggles which threatened the dissolution of his empire, had, in gratitude, liberated the Church from their operation. The noble lord had also referred to several instances in which the monarchs of this country had interfered with the liberties of the Catholic Church; but he begged to remind the noble lord that every case he had mentioned was the act of a despotic monarch, who cared very little either for the civil or religious liberties of their subjects, and invaded both whenever he could. The noble lord had taken the Catholic Archbishops of Armagh and Tuam severely to task because they had not expressed themselves in the same terms of gratitude to the British Legislature which had been used by other prelates of the Church immediately after the passing of the Emancipation Act. The truth was, however, that the policy which had been pursued towards Ireland since the passing of that act had not been such as to command the gratitude either of the laity or the clergy of the Catholic Church. With respect to the supremacy of the Queen, he begged to say that the Catholics entirely acknowledged it in temporal matters. The noble lord spoke of the loyal Catholics and the ultramontane Catholics, and seemed to insinuate rather than openly declare that those Catholics who did not admit the supremacy of the Queen in ecclesiastical as well as temporal matters were not loyal. But he would ask the noble lord if the bishops of the Protestant Church were all agreed with respect to the Queen's supremacy? If he was not mistaken, he had seen within a few weeks past a protest from the Bishop of Exeter and another bishop against the terms in which her Majesty's supremacy was spoken of by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Considering that the bishops of the Protestant Church were divided upon it, and that the Dissenters utterly repudiated the idea of it, he (Mr. O'Connell) thought it rather too much that the noble lord should endeavour by a side-wind to stigmatise as disloyal those Roman Catholics who did not acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Queen. In February, 1844, the noble lord declared that it was "a foolish prohibition" to provide by statute that Roman Catholic bishops should not be allowed to style themselves by the name of the diocese over which they presided. He left the noble lord to reconcile the words which he uttered on that occasion with the declaration he had made to-night; for he (Mr. J. O'Connell) confessed he was unable to reconcile them.

Mr. HENRY DRUMMOND said, he could not be a party to a great deal of the cry which had resounded from one part of the country to another. He could not run a muck against the Roman Catholic Church. He could not refuse to acknowledge that it contained every truth most sacred to man, although he must, at the same time, admit that it had been so perverted that it might fairly be questioned whether or not more evil than good had resulted from it. He confessed he was very much astonished when he heard it asserted that the present case was not one of aggression, because he would defy any gentleman to point out a single instance in history where a parallel case had occurred. He defied them to show any State in Europe where the Pope would have been allowed to do what he had done here. As other occasions might arise on which it would be easy for him to express the satisfaction which he felt at the present position of affairs, he should at that moment refrain from saying more on the subject of those sentiments which recent events were in some respects calculated to call forth. In the present situation of ecclesiastical affairs, after the decision pronounced by the Privy Council, by that selected person who might be considered to have spoken with the voice of the Queen; after the decision that had been pronounced by the country at large; after the opinions given by a great majority of the House of Commons, and by a great majority of the House of Lords, he did rejoice that there was still one Church left which had faith in sacraments, and one that would maintain its faith against all that mere politicians could accomplish. An hon. gentleman had told the House that there was a distinction between the Bishop of Rome and the Court of Rome; and another member of that House declared that that was the first occasion on which he had heard of any such thing; but it was hardly to be supposed that such distinctions were not known and perfectly well understood. It was also well understood and a matter, too, of great practical importance, that the dogmata of Popery were received by those who belonged to the Church of Rome as of the highest authority in things invisible, but that in external and visible things the State alone was paramount. That these were the prevailing opinions in Roman Catholic countries no one who had the least acquaintance with passing events could doubt. It was but recently that the Republic of France had put down in Lyons an association the object of which had been to obtain secular power for the ministers and agents of the Papacy, and these rights, and similar rights of the State, were not merely asserted and acknowledged in France alone, but in

all other countries. In all nations there was an instinctive resistance to the domination of the priesthood—that system which enslaved the laity, and which of all oppression was the most oppressive. What did Cardinal Wiseman himself say in his edition of the “Exercises of Loyola?” He said this:—That no Roman Catholic could dare to be without a spiritual director—a man to direct him in everything—in every thought, word, and action—in every single thing pertaining to him. If that were not the greatest possible slavery, no one could tell what slavery was. But that was not all. They were told that they ought not to be astonished at these proceedings, not to be in the least surprised at them, although it was in the same breath asserted that this measure of the Papacy was merely a sudden thought adopted by the Court of Rome, and although the Pope declared, from the first moment at which he assumed the far-famed chair of St. Peter, that the Court of Rome never gave up the assertion of their right to dispose of the Crown of England. (“No, no!” from a few members.) Had they forgotten the bull *in cœnâ Domini*?—had they forgotten the evidence given before a committee of that House by the Irish Roman Catholic bishops? Over and over again it had been stated, and not disproved, that the Court of Rome claimed to exercise that authority. (“No, no.”) If gentlemen went on with these denials he should be obliged to quote, and that he did not like to do, for quotations wearied the House. Every one well knew that that power was claimed; that the establishment of the claim was most earnestly desired; and, when they were considering about the best modes of resisting this aggressive power, it would be well for them to remember its strength, and the extent to which it had formerly been used. The last rebellion raised by the priests of the Church of Rome was O’Neal’s rebellion, and, from that time forward, they were kept down by the penal laws, and, unfortunately, those laws having been continued, occasioned continual irritation among the great body of the people; it rendered the quiet government of Ireland a matter impossible; and by the aid of that irritation Dr. Cantwell was enabled to persuade too large a number of the people of Ireland that there existed in this country, and in that House and in the House of Peers, a direct conspiracy to starve the people of Ireland and to alienate the estates of the Irish, with a view to their passing into the hands of the Saxons. Now, Bishop Cantwell, giving the people of this country credit for not intending all the evil which the measures of Parliament were calculated to produce, imputing to them no small amount of ignorance and John Bull simplicity, still succeeded in persuading a large proportion of the 7,000,000 of poor deluded Irish that, on the part of the English Government, there existed a settled determination to starve them; and Dr. M’Hale told them that the Poor Law had been enacted with that purpose. Now, he would ask, had any of the Irish members of that House the courage to go back to Ireland and contradict Dr. M’Hale? Not one! The people of Ireland, being Roman Catholics, received everything that their priest told them as if his voice were the voice of God. (“No, no.”) He trusted it would not be necessary for him to quote his authorities in support of that position—a truth which he believed was too generally known to be denied. Did they not every one of them know that the Roman Catholic regarded the voice of his spiritual superior as the voice of God? and, if recent evidence of such a truth were required, he might refer them to what had taken place with respect to the Queen’s colleges in Ireland when Lord Clarendon unfortunately consulted the Roman Catholic bishops about those educational institutions. Then the tidings went to Rome, that the English Protestant Government could no longer rule the Roman Catholic population of Ireland; and then it was that Dr. Cullen was sent to Ireland. If they doubted this statement he might refer them to page 96 and page 109 of Lord Shrewsbury’s pamphlet, who broadly stated that there existed at the Court of Rome an anti-English party, of which the Irish ecclesiastics formed a part, and by them Dr. Cullen was sent over to Ireland as a spy.

Mr. J. O’CONNELL rose to order. He conceived it to be disorderly to charge in that House any absent person with high-treason.

Mr. HENRY DRUMMOND resumed. Dr. Cullen came to Ireland, having long been at Rome an active member of the anti-English party there. Dr. Cullen was there at the time when he must have heard that Smith O’Brien went to France for the purpose of inducing the authorities of the French Republic to assist the Irish in throwing off the authority of England; then it was that the anti-British party thought they could insult England with impunity; they thought that then was the time when the Protestant power might be put down; then it was that Cardinal Wiseman said to the Lieutenant-General of the Jesuits that if they gave him (Dr. Wiseman) the necessary powers he would speedily establish a Jesuits’ college in London. It was for purposes like those that the anti-British party sent Dr. Cullen to Ireland, and put him over the heads of all whom the Irish Roman Catholic bishops had recommended for the primacy to the Pope. He had observed that in the discussion of this question it had been argued that the proceedings of the Court of Rome were fraught with much mischief, and likely to produce hereafter much evil; but that was nothing, or very little, to us, and that we need give ourselves no trouble about the matter. But he confessed himself considerably at a loss to discover how any one could argue so, and at the same time recollect the proceedings in Ireland which the Roman Catholic priesthood adopted in the maintenance of their own power. It was impossible that they could have forgotten the case of the Irish Poor Law union chaplain whom the commissioners had dismissed, and the manner in which Dr. M’Hale called them to account for presuming to interfere with any priest under his jurisdiction. Such proceedings would always be the necessary and unavoidable consequences of conceding to the Church of Rome the powers now claimed. They talked of perfect toleration; but where did perfect toleration exist? There was certainly no Roman Catholic country in which it could be found. Whatever freedom the Roman Catholics enjoyed in the United Kingdom they owed to the soil of

England; to that they owed civil and religious liberty. When Bonaparte had the Pope in his possession he demanded from the head of the Roman Catholic Church that all religions should, in France, be placed on a par; but the Pope peremptorily refused that, and declared such a measure to be impossible, but such a recognition of all religions was wholly rejected by the canons and councils of his Church, that it would be inconsistent with the tranquillity of life, the well-being of society, and could not fail to be attended with the most lamentable consequences. Such was the toleration of the Church of Rome. Hon. members of that House had often expressed themselves most anxious for education, but he for one was opposed to the education which was sanctioned by the Roman Catholic clergy; but he was favourable to sound education, as the only means of encouraging the poor wretches of lay Roman Catholics who were enslaved by the clergy of that persuasion. There was unfortunately a wide distinction between the education given at the schools of the Roman Catholic priests and that given at other places of education. So long as, and to whatever extent, they possessed authority, nothing in the way of education would be communicated, except that which was calculated to enslave the spirits and the minds of the laity. The object of every other sect was to give, by means of education, the greatest possible amount of information; to let in as much light as possible; but the reverse of that was the aim of the Roman Catholic priesthood. The declaration of that body now was, that the Queen's Colleges in Ireland were to have no students, and Cardinal Wiseman claimed ecclesiastical rule in England; yet, in the face of that, hon. members were placing him on the same footing as a Dissenting minister. Did any Dissenting minister speak of disposing of the crown of England, or say that people would be damned if they did not rest "on the rock?" In this system, the bishop was the slave of the cardinal, the priest of the bishop, and the people of the priest. Further, he would ask was the House prepared to sanction the extension of the monastic system in England, of the conventual system, of those secret prisons in which young females were confined? But they were all considered essential to the development and carrying out of the religion of Rome. Again, he would ask, would they allow the monastic institutions to be multiplied in this country till they attained such a height as that their inhabitants would, as clergy, claim immunity from civil obligations, and until, as in the time of Bede, there would not be men enough for the service and defence of the country? Another object of this measure of the Pope's was to take away all trust funds from the English courts of law, and to place them under the sole management of Archbishop Wiseman. That was the real gist of the question. The money was the thing. It mattered very little whether they called Dr. Wiseman Archbishop of Westminster or Archbishop of England; but to take the property of Roman Catholics out of the hands of our courts and get it into their own—that was an object worth attaining. A few years ago a remonstrance was signed by 13 archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, complaining that, by the statute of mortmain, the Government would not allow a poor Papist, at the last hour of his existence, to give some of his land for the salvation of his soul. But did the House see the petition of the Roman Catholic priests against the bishops, in which the former complained that the bishops "got the death-beds," and that they (the priests) got nothing from that source? The assertion that the Papal bull was no attack upon the Queen's supremacy could only arise from real ignorance as to the nature and extent of the Queen's supremacy. If they went back to the earliest times, they found that the Queen was held to be, in the coronation service of Edmund the Confessor, which was very much like that now in use, *persona duplex*. She was *Vicarius Christi*, which declared her spiritual, and not her temporal supremacy. The Sovereign of this country was *persona mixta*—a priest upon his throne. She was prayed for in the Liturgy at the head of ecclesiastical persons, and not of civil governors. She received tithes as an ecclesiastical person, and was anointed with oil, which was a symbol of spiritual, and not of temporal government. Thus every assertion of spiritual authority in this country was an attack upon the Queen's supremacy. He doubted whether we should not be obliged to have a great many more Acts of Parliament to make this question fit in with the present framework of society. He doubted whether the Government could beat back the Papal aggression by anything of the kind now proposed. The priests, he feared, would slip through their fingers, and carry their measures in spite of them. But if the Government found that the view of the Queen's supremacy which he had just asserted, and which was now the law of the land, was no longer tenable, then let them have the manliness to repeal it; but don't let it be expunged from the statute book at the dictate of this insolent prelate.

* * * For continuation of Debate see next Number, Series XX., now ready.

DR. ULLATHORNE AND LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

"TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL,

"My Lord,—In reading the debates of Wednesday and Friday last, some observations that occurred to my mind appear to me of sufficient importance to justify my troubling your lordship with them.

"The reason hinted at by Mr. Anstey why Lord Minto could not have been shown the letter apostolic will not hold good. True the identical letter that was finally published could not have been shown, for the hierarchy was twice remodelled in a portion of its details. But at Rome they print documents of this nature at each stage of proceedings. As I have heard the history from a very good source, before any discussion arose on the point, his Holiness took up the printed document—of course the one first prepared—and put it into his lordship's hands, saying, 'This concerns England,' and Lord Minto laid it down on the table without saying a word. I can perfectly understand that his lordship, not aware of the importance of the

communication and occupied with other thoughts, did not advert sufficiently to the circumstance to remember, but the conclusion drawn by his Holiness was of a different character. He read in it the continuance of the policy of non-interference in our spiritual affairs.

"I have now on my table the minutes of 16 separate conversations, held in 1848, with authorities of the Propaganda, on the subject of the hierarchy. They contain in substance whatever passed between myself and those authorities in either private or official interviews. In none of these is there a single hint or allusion to anything beyond the internal and spiritual affairs of the English Catholic body. I have also lying before me copies of seven memorials, which, with the aid of an English priest, were drawn up and presented to the Holy See by the present writer. Upon the basis of these documents the English Catholic hierarchy in its present form was constituted, with the exception of an additional bishopric added in the arrangement of 1850. In no one of these documents is there any allusion to other objects as in contemplation beyond those of the English Catholic body and their hierarchy, and nothing beyond this occupied the mind of any one engaged in making the arrangement. I assert this the more confidently as the apostolic letter embodies the principles of the memorials with one remarkable exception. I had drawn up a memorial on the subject of the titles. In this I had strongly urged the expediency of appointing an Archbishop of London and a Bishop of York, and showed that this was perfectly conformable to our laws. But on this point, and on this alone, I met with a steady and constant resistance, and that resistance was on the ground that it might give offence to the British Government. I was called in by the Commission of Cardinals whilst in consultation—a very unusual course—that I might be able to explain myself more fully and clearly. I heard and shared in the discussion, and urged my point to the utmost. I even quoted your lordship's opinions, and those of other members of the Cabinet, as expressed in Parliament, besides showing the state of the law, and the utility to ourselves of an arrangement which would leave the bishops undisturbed in the positions where they had resided as Vicars Apostolic, and realise better the dioceses they have to govern; but to no purpose. I was opposed on the ground of delicacy towards the Government. On this ground the whole of that memorial was set aside, and this was the only instance in which suspicion of offence arose. The Cardinals resolved to consult the English bishops individually on this point, and in the interval the insurrection broke out in Rome. But for this the apostolic letter would have come to England in 1848, as the public supposed it had come, and we should most probably have had neither excitement nor persecution, for it would have been quietly promulgated amongst ourselves, and without *ecclat*. Will your lordship allow me to point out that the phrase 'Court of Rome' is an ambiguous and offensive designation, as used instead of 'the Holy See.' It was invented by State canonists and statesmen whose designs were directed against the liberty of the Church. It is of much the same calibre as the phrase 'foreign Sovereign.' It incorporates an error, and is unfair, though your Lordship has not intended it to be so in this instance. Dupin describes a conflict, and takes one side of it; had your lordship read the other side, you would have found the whole of your examples overturned. Allow me to refer to an agreeable work, which explains the true sense of this term, 'Court of Rome,'—Cardinal Pacea's 'Memoirs of his Nunciature on the Rhine.

"Your lordship has made much of the opinions of a few laymen and clergymen as indications of the sense of the English Catholics. But are all laymen, or even clergymen, capable of appreciating the fundamental principles of Church government, or of comprehending the bearings of a measure new to them as a reality? To talk of the establishing a local episcopacy independent of State intervention as ultramontaniam may serve for amusement to our tyros in canon law, but for what other purpose can such an absurdity be used? Why, the gentlemen who formed the 'Cisalpine Club' clamoured for a hierarchy as the surest safeguard against ultramontaniam. Before collecting evidence against us from among ourselves the inquiry should be made of the witnesses, if laymen, whether they are even communicants in our Church; if clergymen, whether they are engaged in its ministry. Then, if they be right on these points, whether they are discontented or disappointed persons—whether they represent any number of their brethren, or only themselves—and whether they have any particular interest to serve or sympathies to conciliate. Not a single person has yet shown himself opposed to us of whom we or any one might not have predicted the course he has taken. What are a dozen out of so large a number more or less disloyal to the body of which they are members?

"I have to thank your lordship for your satisfactory vindication of the Catholic Bishops from the charge of having violated the law. The labours undergone to find out a way of convicting us, so naively related in your speech, have proved our full acquittal. We are not, then, aggressors; for aggression is a crime, and a crime is the violation of a law. The aggression is against us and our Christian liberties. Yes, my lord, I grieve to say it, it is not we who are affected by these acts, unless it be by arousing our pastoral vigilance, filling our churches, diffusing our books, and, according to the reports of our clergy, increasing the number of our converts. The hand of persecution points to one class amongst us, whilst it is another that is made to suffer. The persecution falls upon the tradesmen, workpeople, and poor servants—upon unoffending industry, and the poor seeking their bread. And see how quietly they have borne it all.

"But there is one point for your lordship seriously to consider. The hierarchy is established; therefore it cannot be abolished, except through the physical extermination of the Catholic Church in these realms: or, which God forbid, through universal apostasy. How can you deal with this fact? You have quoted a legal principle from Jeremy Taylor, which he took, with many others, from the Jesuit Suarez. Allow me to suggest another. Is it wise and in the spirit of a profound legislation to put the religious teachers of a large body of her Majesty's subjects in conscientious opposition to the law—to force them to put the principle of Divine law in opposition to a human enactment—to make their very bishops the incorporation of such a fact? Will it aid the sanctions of the State, and that opinion, which, as your lordship views it, is the best support of law and government, to force us into a position where, standing, as we are bound to do, upon the law of God and our conscience, we are compelled to count for nothing enactments which we can only consider as assaults upon the cause of Heaven and of our souls—enactments which, in fact, come from no divine fountain of justice, but are the offspring of party contests and sectarian dislikes? We can make distinctions between the just and the unjust, and keep our reverence for the former, but to the mind of the multitude the sense of one unjust law which they are obliged in conscience to condemn is a taint upon the whole course of justice.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your Lordship's very obedient servant,

"W. B. ULLATHORNE.

"Bishop's-house, Birmingham, Feb. 10."

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

PAPAL AGGRESSION.—HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FEB. 7, 1851.

(Continuation of Debate from the Nineteenth Series.)

Mr. E. B. ROCHE could have supposed during the last half hour that he was in Exeter-hall, listening to some of the minor canons who held forth in that edifice. It was evident that whatever might be the religious opinions of the hon. member for West Surrey, he was one of that class who did not hesitate to rush in "where angels fear to tread." His speech afforded a slight indication of the evil that this measure of the noble lord's was likely to produce in this country and in Ireland. The noble lord's speech was entirely unsuited to the measures he was about to introduce. He did not complain that the measure was unsuited to the speech, but the speech was a homage to the fell spirit of religious discord and sectarian bigotry to the raising of which he had been a party. But the measure, although he had grave faults to find in it, fell very short of anything that might have been anticipated from the noble lord's speech. The noble lord had spoken of what he termed the late act of Papal aggression as if it were very little short of high-treason: but Sir E. Sugden had shown that the 13th of Elizabeth was sufficient to meet any offence against the law, such as this had been described to be. He denied that there was any necessity to make the bill applicable to Ireland. In the reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the remonstrance of the archbishops and bishops of the Established Church in Ireland, his Grace said that the reason why the Irish prelates had not been invited to join in the address of the English hierarchy to the Queen was, that they had to complain of an aggression which only affected the Church of England. He was warranted, therefore, in saying, upon the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that the proposed measure was utterly needless in Ireland. The measure was, indeed, an attempt to ignore the Roman Church in the whole empire, although that Church has been virtually recognised by that House, and by successive Governments, in the colonies as well as in Ireland. When Lord Stanley was Colonial Secretary, the Bishop of Australia, in March 1843, wrote to his lordship to complain of the introduction of a Papal bull exactly similar to that recently issued. This bull constituted a Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, and gave that prelate metropolitan jurisdiction in New Holland. What was Lord Stanley's answer to the remonstrance? His lordship directed the Governor to acquaint the Bishop of Australia that his letter had been received, but that his lordship must decline the discussion of the question which it raised. That despatch he (Mr. Roche) thought was sufficiently significant. Did he find fault with Lord Stanley for it? Far otherwise. He thought his lordship, in declining to take any coercive step, acted the part of a sound-judging and discreet statesman. But the measure that was now proposed was a direct attack on Lord Stanley for that conduct, and he hoped his hon. friend the member for Buckinghamshire would be prepared to join with him in opposing it, and in defending the act of his chief on that occasion. But, if the measure was a direct attack on Lord Stanley, and in contravention of our policy in the colonies, what was it with regard to Lord Clarendon and the policy pursued in Ireland; and also of the late Government of Sir R. Peel, of which Lord Stanley was a member? Now, how had we treated the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland? By more than one Act of Parliament and by innumerable acts of the Executive in that country we had recognised the Roman Catholic Church and the dignitaries of that Church in Ireland. The first was the Bequests Act of the 7th and 8th Victoria, c. 96. Subsequently, during the government of the late Lord Bessborough, a committee was appointed by a Queen's letter, to decide who were to take under that act and who were not; and in that letter the Roman Catholic bishops were designated as the bishops of certain sees. They had heard, too, a great deal from the noble lord, and from his supporters in and out of that House, about interference with the Queen's supremacy. What was the case as to the law upon that point? There was an Act of Parliament relating to Ireland which virtually repealed the Act of Supremacy *pro tanto*; it certainly was only a local act, but it was an important one—it was the Dublin Cemeteries Act. It was passed in 1846, and gave certain powers to "his Grace Archbishop Murray and his successors exercising the same jurisdiction which he exercised in the diocese of Dublin as an archbishop." That was a direct recognition of Archbishop Murray's spiritual jurisdiction in the diocese of Dublin; and, seeing that Archbishop Murray derived his spiritual jurisdiction from the Pope, it was *pro tanto* a recognition of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope in Ireland; and he defied any legal member of the Government to contradict him, when he said that the Cemeteries Act of Dublin was *pro tanto* a repeal of the Act of Supremacy in Ireland. Again, on her Majesty's late visit to Ireland, the Executive Government issued, in the *Dublin Gazette*, a notice that her Majesty was pleased to desire that the following persons should have the *entrée* of the Castle:—the Primate, the Chancellor, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Roman Catholic Primate, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the Duke of Leinster, the Cabinet Ministers; so that the Roman Catholic

Primate and Archbishop of Dublin took precedence over the Duke of Leinster and her Majesty's Ministers, the Protestant bishops, and, as an hon. friend reminded him, of the University of Dublin. Then he said that, in extending this measure to Ireland, they were ignoring the existence almost of the Roman Catholic Church altogether, and were taking a retrograde movement as regarded civil and religious liberty. It was no answer to say that, as to what had been done in Ireland, the Emancipation Act had been broken, and that the Roman Catholic bishops rendered themselves amenable to fines. No doubt they did so, but who were the wrong-doers, if wrong were done? Not the bishops, or their flocks, and co-religionists, but her Majesty's Executive in that country, and this bill was a direct censure upon Lord Clarendon and the Executive when the noble lord, in bringing it forward, said that the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland had committed a breach of the Emancipation Act. If, indeed, any person ought to be prosecuted for such breach it ought to be, not the bishops themselves, but the Executive for giving them precedence. But in his opinion Lord Clarendon could not have acted with greater discretion than in giving to the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland the designation of the sees to which they had been elevated, and the House would be wrong in now abandoning their own Lord-Lieutenant in Ireland, and their own pledges and principles, by now turning on that Lord-Lieutenant, saying what he had done was illegal, and bringing in a bill to compel those right rev. prelates to abandon the titles they had borne. Why, an Act of Indemnity would be required for Lord Clarendon and the other members of the Government in Ireland who sanctioned those proceedings. The noble lord had shown no case for extending this measure to Ireland. He did not think he had shown a very strong case for England, but that he did not regard so much as the former. He knew very little about Cardinal Wiseman, and cared very little about him as an individual—he did not care if Dr. Wiseman accepted the invitation which the noble lord had so hospitably given him that evening to go and live at Rome; but he said they were committing a bad act by extending this measure to the oppression of Ireland. Not only as regarded England, but Ireland too, it would have been more prudent if the noble lord paused before he entered upon this religious controversy; for, from what he saw out of doors, as well as from what he had heard within, and especially from the speech of the hon. member for West Surrey, it was likely to descend into a religious dispute and scramble. He wished he could change that feeling into one of anxious desire on the part of the people of Ireland to apply themselves to the regeneration of their country and the pursuit of industry. He feared not only that he would fail in that, but that every one else would also fail, while the noble lord and those who supported him made aggressions on the Church of Rome. It was not too late, if not to withdraw the measure, to remove from it all that related to Ireland, and he trusted that that course would be taken, for no cause had been shown why Ireland should be included in it.

Mr. MOORE said, The noble lord at the head of the Government had displayed that evening a research in history that would entitle him to fill the chair of history in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. The noble lord had undertaken to prove that there was a principle in Popery which required repression—that its full development was dangerous to the Government and to the community, and that therefore it was our duty, as it was the duty of our despotic ancestors, to repress the religion by statute. The noble lord cited authorities of despotic countries which would not permit the development of such institutions; but he (Mr. Moore) would ask what were those instances? Asserting the conduct of William the Conqueror, the Governments of the middle ages and the Governments in this country as examples, was neither more nor less than calling upon us to adopt the policy of despotic Governments, and to abandon the fundamental principles of free institutions. The two principles of Zoroaster were not more distinct and antagonistic than the two principles here involved. Despotic Governments of the present time maintained that it was the duty of the State to repress and to prevent the development of all principles they deemed dangerous to the Government and the community; but free countries maintained, or used to maintain, it was not the province of the State to interfere with opinion, and that, on the contrary, the free growth and development of public opinion was the very sap and vitality of free institutions. The noble lord had omitted, as the hon. member for Sheffield had observed, the case of America from the catalogue. America was the only case analogous to our own. That was a free country, and the Pope might send thither as many cardinals as he pleased. If they disobeyed the law of the land they would be punished; if they attempted to subvert any institution of the country they were amenable to the law; but they might call themselves by what names they pleased as long as they kept their hands out of other people's pockets; and they might inculcate the canon law to their heart's content so long as they obeyed the law of the land. But it was said that even in the time of our Catholic ancestors, all attempts of the Pope to name bishops to English sees had been resisted by the Crown and the people of England. Why, in those times, the bishops were not only spiritual prelates but were great temporal potentates. Over the laws of marriage and of inheritance they exercised great influence; and, to hand over to a foreign prince such powers as these would be to surrender to his discretion no inconsiderable portion of the revenue and the judicial and executive power of the country. But there was no comparison between the case of those prelatial princes and that of a parcel of poor priests receiving nothing but a very slight revenue from the country. In the present case, it was not whether the nomination of the bishops should be vested in the Crown or in the Pope, but whether they should be nominated at all. They protested against the nomination of a foreign prince in this matter, but in what position did they come forward—as plaintiffs? Did they come into court with clean hands? Had they fulfilled in every way the duties of Government as to those with regard to

whom they now deprecated foreign interference? Had that wretched man who was convicted the other day for ill-treating one whom he was bound to care for indicted a stranger for giving food to Jane Wilbred, his protest against foreign interference would not have been more preposterous than theirs in this instance. The Sovereign, on her coronation, protested against the religion of one-third of her subjects. The Legislature, upon compulsion, tolerated what it had failed to exterminate. If one-third of the people of this country were not trodden down into helots or degraded into savages it had not been for want of will in the British Legislature. Their temporal rights were acknowledged, but over the whole Catholic population was still maintained a system of ecclesiastical tyranny, of robbery and oppression, which had been condemned by the universal verdict of civilised man. This dog-in-the-manger principle of the Government towards the Roman Catholics of this country would never do; there must be either connexion or non-interference. It was said that, after all that had been said and done in the last three months, to recede now would be to insult the people of England; he would say, that after all that had been done for liberal principles in the last fifty years, to retrograde from those principles now would be a far greater insult to the people of England. It seemed to be suggested that the recent agitation had elicited an unanimous verdict of the people of England against Roman Catholicism, but the verdict was at the utmost merely the opinion of two-thirds of the population against the religion of the remaining third. As to any argument, there had been nothing worthy of the designation. At no one of the hundred and more anti-Popery meetings had there been a single speech characterised by a lucid, statesmanlike, intelligible exposition of Protestant views; not one single scintillation of genius had flashed forth. A grand storm had been promised, but all that was realised was a Scotch mist, drenching the souls of men with a long, dreary drizzle of scurrility and cant. Surely the masculine sense of the English people had not retrograded into the second childhood imputed to it by the no Popery orators, so that it was losing sight of the stern realities of life in turbid dreams of morbid and unmeaning apprehensions regarding the giant strides of crime as less dangerous than the infinitesimal progress of Popery, Puseyism as more alarming than pauperism, and ultramontane bishops as worse than bankruptcy and ruin. If such, indeed, were the case, then the Legislature must exercise its noblest function, its highest responsibility, and assert against the wild cry of three months' agitation the steady, continuous, and consistent development of public opinion in the last half-century. If the people of England really wished Parliament to resist Popery, the object would not be attained by the noble lord's saying that particular Roman Catholic bishops should not assume particular names. As to the notorious letter of the noble lord, on which all this agitation was based, Papal aggression had been confessedly only a second consideration with the noble lord in penning it. The real object of apprehension with the noble lord was that Protestant Church, which he saw around him, rent asunder by internecine convulsions, like a disintegrated planet—torn to pieces by its High Church party, strongly suspected of a tendency to Roman Catholicism—its Low Church party leaning to Protestant Dissent—and its Church of England party, who cried, "A plague upon both your Houses;" morbidly fearful that between the two the coach would be upset. In this state of things the noble lord had taken the part of turning Church Dissenter himself, setting up the banner of royalty against the banner of the Church, appointing other Church Dissenters to all the vacant bishoprics, snubbing the bishops who did not agree with him, swamping the ecclesiastical courts, blockading the Church, and storming the universities. The fact was, that the Papal aggression had been a regular godsend to the noble lord; Cardinal Wiseman a whipping-boy on whom to flog the Anglican truants, and the cry of invasion from without a cover behind which to quell treason within. The noble lord affected surprise that the Roman Catholics should be offended at his letter—at his merely "walloping his own nigger," to use a Transatlantic expression; but this affectation was simply preposterous. If this bill were passed, the only reply to it that Ireland would make would be open defiance—the unequivocal and unhesitating refusal to obey—a refusal attended by entire impunity, since, prosecute any man in Ireland for disobedience to the enactment, and not a jury throughout the country would give a verdict against him.

Mr. BRIGHT should not have risen to speak immediately after a gentleman with whom, to a great extent, he agreed, but that he supposed no one on the Treasury bench would think it necessary to say anything after the noble lord's speech; and gentlemen opposite were probably so much taken aback by that speech as to require time for considering out of doors what course they had best adopt in the matter. The question now before the House some gentlemen seemed to consider of light importance, while others deemed it a very grave matter. Among the latter class was the noble lord, who had shown more than usual feeling and excitement in the delivery of his address that evening. He did not propose to make many observations on the course which had been taken in the first instance by the noble lord, though he thought it open to great animadversion. The worst he could say of the noble lord's letter perhaps was, that it had been penned under feelings of excitement which were hardly becoming in a Prime Minister. Of the excitement which animated the noble lord at the time there could be no question, and, indeed, there was no dispute about it. That excitement, however, had reference, according to the noble lord's own statement in the letter itself, still more to the apprehensions he entertained of the enemy within his gates than to any fear of foreign invasion. Now, he should have supposed that a Prime Minister, conscious of the magnitude of this question, would have placed in the Queen's Speech some distinct reference to this most impending and more important danger that he apprehended, and that instead of this light measure, having relation to the confessedly minor peril, he would have brought forward some

proposition for averting the danger which he considered to menace the Church from the enemies within her own bosom. The noble lord had thought fit to appeal to the bigotry of the country, and the bigotry of the country came to his aid, supported by many auxiliaries, who, though not themselves bigoted, still followed the noble lord's banner, and the end was the little miserable measure now before the House. The noble lord must take care that he was not, like the person of whom they had heard in old, perhaps in fabulous times, devoured by his own hounds; and that the measure which he calculated upon to give him popularity did not involve the destruction of his Cabinet. He might be allowed, for the sake of argument at all events, to assume, from the number of meetings that had been held on the subject, that the people of England regarded the present as an extraordinary occasion. This feeling had been founded upon their impression that the Roman Catholic religion was making rapid strides in the United Kingdom, of which progress they regarded the Pope's letter as an indication, and upon their conviction, in which he entirely concurred, that the return of this country to Catholicism would be a great calamity. Ireland was overrun with this Roman Catholic religion, and in England, he understood, there was a yielding and falling back to it. But that was not the question for us to discuss at all. We were discussing it in consequence of the errors of our forefathers. The American Minister had been in the House at the beginning of the speech of the noble lord, and he (Mr. Bright) had watched his countenance during that speech, and he had asked himself, what could that man think of the people and the Parliament of England that in the year 1851 they should be discussing a question such as this—an imaginary sentiment and nothing more? The real question that they should consider while this subject was before them was, how far our past policy had tended to suppress that religion, and to make this a Protestant country and a Protestant empire. In Ireland, there could be no doubt that the Roman Catholic religion was more prevalent at this time than at any former period since the connexion of England with that country, and he had no hesitation in saying that the tendency of all our proceedings in past times had been to give strength and permanence to that religion. He did not much believe that in England it was gaining any great ground, but there was a large emigration from Ireland into England, and he believed that in Lancashire even, the great bulk of Catholicism to be found had been imported from Ireland; but whatever there was of conversion to what was called Popery in this country, was to be found among the clergy of the Established Church; and there were very few of the laity, he believed, who were much infected with those principles. The object of Parliaments for a long period had been to exterminate Catholicism by exterminating Catholics. From 1690 to 1778, the most stringent penal laws had been enacted against Roman Catholics, and it was not from any increased liberalism, but only because England became engaged in a dangerous war with the United States that that code was relaxed. From that period down to 1829, the process had been one of gradual but slow relaxation, every little right and privilege gained by the Catholics of Ireland being gained only by incessant struggles. Now, in Ireland there existed an establishment whose safety consisted in its being overlooked—the Irish Church, which had been placed in that country to convert the Roman Catholics, and to be a bond of union between Great Britain and Ireland. That Church had had at its disposal the whole power and favour of the Crown and of Parliament, the army, and the police; while its property amounted to a principal sum of 20,000,000*l.* sterling, the interest of which had annually gone to its bishops and priests. That Church, moreover, had leagued with the civil power, and there was not an act of oppression which the civil power had committed in Ireland that had not been either in obedience to that Church or with its most cordial consent; and more, that Church had denounced every statesman who had ever attempted to give anything like freedom to the Catholic population of Ireland, the noble lord himself among the number. The Irish Roman Catholics, however, had not been exterminated; and Governments had yet to learn that there was one thing almost as indestructible as truth, and that was a persecuted error. He recollected a saying of an ancient father of the Church in the eighth century, who, speaking of the difficulty of converting the Saxons, said, that if the clergy had attempted to convert them with kindness and generosity, he thought they would not so long have resisted the rite of baptism. He said, "*Sint predicatores, non pradatores.*" But that Church had even said to the State, "If you will defend me with the sword, I will defend you with the pen;" and he (Mr. Bright) confessed that he looked upon that system as at the root of the extended Catholicism now to be found in Ireland, and the pertinacious adherence to that Church which was found to exist more rankly in Ireland than in any other Catholic country in the world. The Catholic religion triumphed, and our legislation had borne fruit to Rome both in Ireland and England. Then, again, let them look at the English Church—that great institution which was intended to be the bulwark of Protestantism, but which had turned out to be a kind of manufactory for a description of home Popery. That Church had the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge at its command, the army and police, and some two dozen bishops in the House of Lords. The noble lord had stated that he was opposed to ecclesiastical influence in temporal affairs, yet there were some twenty-four or twenty-six bishops in the other House who always sat behind the Government. One of those—the archbishop—had an income of 15,000*l.* a-year. He had heard the noble lord say that an arrangement had been made by which the salary should be reduced from some unknown and almost fabulous amount to 15,000*l.*

per annum; and he said, with a coolness which he (Mr. Bright) thought almost inimitable, that he hoped that would be "quite satisfactory." Then they were invested with a pomp and a state that belonged to no other persons. A bishop had been sent to Jerusalem the other day. He could not travel like any other mortal, but he must go out in the steam-frigate *Devastation*; and, no doubt, within a stone's throw of the place where the Apostle dwelt in the house of "one Simon, a tanner," he would land under a salute of twenty guns. As another instance, he was reading the other day in a Bombay paper that the Bishop of Madras had sailed out of the port; and it was stated, as a matter of great importance, that he had been honoured with the salute "due to his rank and dignity." This Church, then, had the Crown at its disposal, and Parliament at its back. The noble lord himself, having gained experience from the period when he was before in office, had made a compact with the bishops. Nobody could have watched the noble lord since 1846 without seeing that there was a league, offensive and defensive, between him and the bishops—he was to let the bishops alone, and the bishops were to let him alone. In addition to this influence, the Church had nearly 15,000 priests at its disposal, 5,000 of those being presented by private patrons. He brought no charge against those ministers, for he knew that an institution that had stood so long, and that was even yet so much venerated and respected as the Church of England, must have within its borders great numbers of men who had gained the admiration of the people by their piety and the services that they had rendered in the districts in which they lived. Still, it was a Church of ascendancy and domination. It had a revenue amounting to millions—he was frightened to say how much. In fact, the Parliamentary plummet had never yet sounded the depths of that chest out of which it derived its revenues, for no orders of that House upon the subject had ever been fairly and faithfully answered. Yet, with all these advantages, and established as it had been for the express purpose of becoming the bulwark of Protestantism, it not only had not saved the country from Popery, but it was, according to the statement of the noble lord, most deeply infected with Popery itself. If in any other department they had a machine which so totally failed in accomplishing everything for which it had been established, would they not change it or totally abolish it? Let them look at the history of that Church. It had started, he would say, without questioning the motive, under Henry VIII., and it had been made very much what it was at present by Elizabeth, herself hating the Pope of Rome, because she had resolved to be Pope at home. In the reign of James I. it was urging constantly to tyranny and persecution. In Charles the First's reign it did much to overturn the throne, and it cost that monarch his head; for prelacy united with the Crown was so heavy that the Crown sank with it; and in Charles the Second's time the Dissenters were persecuted right and left, there being scarcely an old prison in England where they might not be shown George Fox's dungeon, or the Quaker's cell, or some room dignified by such a title. All that went on up to the time of the Toleration Act; but what was the Church at the present time? Its revenues remained enormous. The Established Church had been, during all periods, and was still, the steady and consistent opponent of every article of legislative reform proposed in this country. The bishops, as a rule, always opposed reform. The Established Church was a political Church, to begin with, as its Articles showed. So long as it was merely a political Church it worked on with tolerable harmony, but its danger now was that zeal had found its way into its ranks, and he believed that every zealous churchman was at this moment, though unconsciously perhaps, working for its overthrow. Look at its present condition; he (Mr. Bright) felt commiseration for it himself, as he felt sympathy for the Wesleyan body, now rent with so serious a schism. The character of the Church of England was disputed within its own border; its creed was denied; its clergy were split into three or four sects; and dissenting sects felt no hostility towards each other compared with the hostility between these sects; and he believed no one in that House would say that the Church of England could last for a month as a united Church if it were not for the vast possessions which the Parliament and Government had placed at its disposal. The principle of the Establishment must necessarily come up in these discussions. Ireland repudiated the Establishment, and, so far as the Church existed there as an establishment, it would happily before long be abrogated. Scotland repudiated it; so did Wales—nine-tenths of its people were Dissenters. In England a very large, and intelligent, and growing population repudiated the Establishment also, and what was called the Queen's supremacy. Now, the noble lord was proposing what in his (Mr. Bright's) opinion was a sham. Its effect could only be to bolster up the Church Establishment. His pretences about "religious liberty"—or he would say (though he had not meant the term offensively) his statements with regard to it—appeared to be of a very curious nature. He forgot that there was an ascendancy Church in this country, which repudiated any of the advances of Dissent as well as of Popery. Some Dissenters had joined him in his cry; there was a body called "the Three Denominations," who had the privilege of going up to the Queen, and always seemed very anxious to use the privilege; but they did not represent the Dissenters. The Dissenters in the north had held aloof from the cry. It was stated in the Life of Dr. Fletcher of Stepney, an Independent minister of considerable distinction, that in November, 1841, he preached and published a sermon on the birth of the Prince of Wales, and he transmitted a copy of it to her Majesty through the Lord Chamberlain, Earl Delawarr; but the Lord Chamberlain wrote in reply that he did not consider it consistent with his duty as a public officer to present it to her Majesty, as it had not, and obviously could not, have the sanction of the Established Church. Dr. Fletcher asked for more definite reasons if they could be given, and Lord

Delawarr answered that he considered the fact of the discourse having been delivered in a Dissenting meeting-house to be of itself sufficient to justify him in declining to present it to the Queen. That did not show any great disposition to regard the Dissenters and the members of the Established Church with an equal eye. There was a gentleman of the same name with the noble lord at the head of the Government, who, in a parish in this city, for the sake of the accumulation of his salary, annually entered, by proxy, the meeting-house in which was held the yearly meeting of the society of which he (Mr. Bright) was a member, and annually stripped it of a certain number of tables and seats to pay the salary of a minister of "the most tolerant Church upon earth," and that was done in the midst of a city whose municipal and parochial authorities had been affrighting almost the whole country by the hubbub they had made upon this question. How would the question be treated in the United States? That consideration would illustrate the true mode of dealing with the Catholic religion. The Catholic religion there was chiefly professed by immigrants. A very intelligent gentleman from that country told him (Mr. Bright) last week, that it was a very rare thing for a native American to become a Roman Catholic; that many of the immigrants, especially the next generation, left the Catholic Church; that the practices of that Church were not so rigidly carried out as in this country, and that there were secessions from the Catholic Church in considerable numbers. He (Mr. Bright) had with him an account in an American paper of a priest and his congregation so seceding; a discourse was delivered upon the occasion with candles lighted at mid-day, and then at the close, to signify the transition they were making, the candles were put out and the light of day was let in. When had anything like that taken place in Ireland? Lord Burleigh, the Minister of Queen Elizabeth, said that though the Puritans were too squeamish in their scruples, their catechising and preaching were the most effectual mode of preventing the growth of Popery. If he (Mr. Bright) were a Catholic, the only mode in which he could become anything else would be, not by being dragooned into it, but by being encouraged to inquire. The bill proposed would be impotent for the object professed. The matter was not worth legislating upon; but if the country were to be affrighted, it was but fair to bring in a more substantial measure. Being against any legislation upon the subject, believing it would be useless, believing this measure more fitted to meet the prejudices of a few people out of doors than the evil which the noble lord pronounced to exist, he (Mr. Bright) could not give his assent to the bill.

Mr. DISRAELI said, I wish to recall the attention of the House for a moment from that controversial rhetoric to which, I fear, the policy of the Government is likely to afford considerable scope. I want to explain the reason why I shall give my vote for the introduction of this bill; and I do so because I think it is of interest that the people, the community in general, should see what is the result of that remarkable agitation which has been festered by the Government, and led, I hesitate not to admit, to a national demonstration that perhaps has seldom been equalled. I cannot but think that to-morrow, when the reports of the contents of this bill are made known to the country, there will be a feeling of great disappointment, and I will add of great mortification. Let us remember for a moment what this bill is intended to combat. It is to combat an aggression. Let the House remember the origin of that now familiar but fearful term. It is the expression of the Minister, selected by himself, and offered to the country as the ground for that appeal both to the passions and the reason of the nation, which he in his wisdom felt it his duty to make. This, then, is the weapon which the First Minister of the Crown, after three months of unexampled agitation in the country—after three months' consultation with his colleagues—has prepared to defend the Church and the State from this great "aggression" which he has denounced. I do not think the weapon is equal to the office for which it is intended. Many will be of opinion that it is a somewhat small result after the antecedents which have so attracted public notice. Was it for this that the Lord Chancellor of England trampled on a cardinal's hat amidst the patriotic acclamations of a metropolitan municipality? Was it for this that the First Minister, with more reserve and delicacy, intimated to the assembled judges that there had been occasions when perhaps even greater dangers were at hand, and when the shadow of the Armada threatened the seas of England? Was it for this that all the counties and corporations of England met—that all the learned and religious societies assembled at a period most inconvenient, in order, as they thought, to respond to the appeal of their Sovereign, and lose no time in assuring her Majesty that they would guard her authority and supremacy; that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, that the great City of London itself, went in solemn procession, to offer at the foot of the Throne the assurance of their devotion; that the electric telegraph brought her Majesty's responses to those addresses, that not an instant might be lost in reassuring the courage of the inhabitants of the metropolis? And what are these remedies? Some Roman Catholic priests are to be prevented from taking titles which hitherto they have been prevented by the law that existed from taking to a considerable extent; the only difference being that they are now prevented from taking territorial titles which have not been assumed by prelates of the national Church, and that by a penalty of what amount—40s. perhaps—is not stated. But a penalty of that amount would, in my opinion, be worthy of the occasion. Is this all? Is a piece of petty persecution the only weapon we can devise on a solemn political exigency of this vast importance? At the best, it is a great political exigency met by a remedy purely technical. Not a single principle has been asserted or vindicated; and no substantial evil will be remedied. But mark the address by which

this insignificant project is introduced. I grant you that between that project and the *proemium* the difference was most significant. If the noble lord had been about to introduce a proposition for the revival of the penal laws, the proportions of his speech could not have been more colossal. I remember, when the letter of the noble lord first appeared, an appeal having been made to me by my constituents; I recommended them to pause before they acted, and thoroughly to understand the question at issue. I told them that it was not sufficient to record their loyalty to the Crown, and hurry into some hasty approbation of a crude project of Legislation, but that this was a wide and comprehensive question, and it was impossible to legislate for England without legislating for Ireland. What was the answer of the authorities that then supported Government and then influenced opinion? They derided the idea of legislating for Ireland. We were told that was an exceptional case; that the circumstances were perfectly distinct, and that it was not the intention of the Minister to make this measure apply to Ireland. But mark the speech of the Minister to-night. It was no longer the Papal aggression of October or November that the noble lord lays down as the foundation of these new laws. I find the noble lord going at once to Ireland, and seeking, as the basis of his legislation, the Synod of Thurles, and not the visit of Dr. Wiseman to England. But, after having treated the question of the Synod of Thurles in a spirit, I am bound to admit, worthy of the subject—which is a great, serious, and awful subject—what does the noble lord do but immediately introduce a bill which bears no reference whatever to the Synod of Thurles, or any synodical action in any of the kingdoms of her Majesty. These are inconsistencies which, after three months of inconsistency, I am surprised should again occur. I did expect that the Government, after frequent councils and opportunities, would at least have brought forward a measure consistent with the exposition of the First Minister. What is the excuse or reason given by the noble lord to-night for this strong contrast between his introductory statement and his meagre proposition? It is, forsooth, that the business, he begins to believe, is insignificant. How does the noble lord describe the Papal aggression, which for three months, through the instrumentality of the noble lord, had excited the passions of the whole people? The Pope's letter is described to-night as a blunder of the sudden—a somewhat strong phrase, and one which some persons might think applicable to other letters. I cannot believe the conduct of the Pope has been precipitate conduct, or not duly conceived and matured. I form my opinion from circumstances of public notoriety, and from the gradual occurrence of incidents and events which might well have justified his Holiness in the course he has adopted. When I recollect what has occurred in Ireland and in the colonies with respect to Roman Catholic bishops—that the Viceroy of Ireland, the representative of our Sovereign, has been in direct communication with the Pope himself; that he expressed his high veneration for the character of his Holiness; that he consulted him, and deferred to his judgment—I cannot agree that the conduct of the Pope, right or wrong, was a sudden act, or a course of behaviour and policy adopted without due reason and encouragement. But, besides all that occurred in Ireland and the colonies with respect to the introduction of Roman Catholic prelates, besides the letter of Lord Clarendon—that letter which has never yet been vindicated—not very long ago the First Minister expressed himself on the subject of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in a passage to which I referred the other night from memory, but which, strange to say, numerous as have been the quotations from speeches of the noble lord, has never yet been cited during these debates. Thus spoke Lord John Russell, according to our authoritative record in July, 1845: “He believed they might repeal those disallowing clauses which prevented the Roman Catholic bishops from assuming titles held by bishops of the Established Church.” The noble lord saw no objection whatever but a few years ago to Roman Catholic bishops assuming titles held by bishops of the Established Church. He had no objection whatever to Dr. Wiseman then coming to this country, and styling himself Archbishop of Canterbury. “He could not conceive any good grounds for the continuance of these restrictions.” Does the noble lord suppose the opinion of so eminent an individual on subjects of such paramount interest was not duly noted and duly known? that such an opinion expressed in the House of Commons by such a man was not immediately furnished to the Vatican?—and when the Pope was aware that it was the opinion of so eminent a personage, when the representative of our Sovereign was indirectly communicating with him in a tone of deferential homage, when he might read in the records of the Irish Court that his archbishops and bishops took the highest precedence—an unfortunate circumstance now satisfactorily accounted for, though a more convenient subordinate never yet appeared in a public discussion—is it just or fair—is the noble lord authorised to state to-night that the conduct of the Pope was a blunder of the sudden? I don't enter into the question whether a communication was made or not to my Lord Minto. This I will say, that we have had details to-night which prove that some communication was made; and, certainly, I am very much surprised that an envoy on a mission so confidential should be apprised, by the candour of his Holiness, that there is something here which touched England nearly, and never have the curiosity to ask, “Pray, what is it?” On his next mission, I have no doubt Lord Minto will profit by his previous experience; and I must say, of all public men employed on public missions, Lord Minto has run the most remarkable course of any individual in the public service. There are Financial Reformers present who have animadverted, among other things, on diplomacy. So far as I can form an opinion from

the operations of the distinguished amateur whose name has been so frequently brought before Parliament of late, I should be led, whether a mission were open or secret, for war or for peace, or even for religion, to prefer a professional diplomatist. The course taken by the Government was not only very unsatisfactory for the present, but extremely perilous for the future. It is a great evil, after all, that has occurred to bank the feelings of the nation. But that is a minor evil compared with the prospect held out by the noble lord this evening of ulterior measures and future legislation. The noble lord seems to have chalked out an almost illimitable career, which commences with petty persecution, perhaps to terminate with national disaster. But he will never accomplish a solution, worthy a statesman, of a great political difficulty. What is the prospect before us? Suppose there is another Papal aggression—and with the encouragement it has received I think we may reasonably count upon one—there is to be another measure adapted to the new assault upon the supremacy of the Sovereign; party passions still more embittered; public prejudices still more excited; rancour, hatred, malice, and the *odium theologicum* prevailing everywhere. A new measure will produce another aggression; another “blunder of a sudden,” and this “blunder of a sudden” will be made year after year, to be met with some law of a sudden, though I am afraid not so sudden in the result. Thus we shall have the Whigs governing England by a continual Popish plot, which is never to be brought to an end. In my opinion, the existence of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in a Protestant country not recognised by the law is a great political evil. To reconcile the recognition of such a hierarchy by the law with a regard to complete respect for the civil and religious liberties of Roman Catholics is a political problem difficult to solve. But though it may be difficult to solve, it is in my mind not impossible, not by any concordat with a foreign Prince, but by the internal and essential power of an English Parliament. I do not say that it is a political difficulty which any cautious statesman, under any circumstances, would have created. I do not mean to say it is a measure that a man would have gone out of his way to introduce to Parliament, but I say this, that when a statesman has taken the course which the noble lord has taken, he is bound to attempt to solve that political problem, and to introduce a measure equal to the occasion, and not meet the great political exigencies which he may have fostered, if not created, by a technical remedy unworthy the dignity of Parliament. That is the view I take of the conduct of the Government. I shall not oppose the introduction of this bill. I think the introduction of the bill is the severest condemnation of the conduct which has been pursued during the last three months. If the House pass this bill they do nothing. We do not cope with the question we are bound to meet; and all we will do will be to engender just the same difficulty greatly aggravated by our inefficiency, the spirit with which we have recognised our danger, and the craven manner in which we have shrunk from meeting the difficulty that we have ourselves created.

Mr. M. J. O'CONNELL was not sorry to find that Ireland was included in the bill, and he hoped his hon. friend who had given notice of a motion to exclude it would not persevere in his proposal. If wrong had been done by the Roman Catholics of England their brethren in Ireland were sharers in the guilt, and ought to be sharers in the punishment. As to the charge of want of loyalty brought against Roman Catholics, all he would say was that, as an individual, he did not hold his loyalty to be at all affected by what had fallen from the noble lord. He denied that there existed any disloyalty to her Majesty among her Roman Catholic subjects. The proposed bill would be a source of great annoyance, but it would have no other effect, for he believed it would be a failure. He could say with confidence that the letter which the noble lord, unfortunately for his reputation, had written, had been the means of leading many moderate-minded persons in Ireland to adopt much stronger views than they previously held.

Sir R. H. INGLIS said, In the course of the evening the hon. member for Manchester had made a most elaborate attack upon the Church of England; but he ventured to say that if any one took the liberty to dissect that speech the statements it contained would be completely overturned. With regard to the refusal of a sermon which a Dissenting minister wished to present to her Majesty, he (Sir R. Inglis) had never heard of the case before, and he was, of course, ignorant of the circumstances under which the refusal was given. It was well known, however, that the custom was, that all persons who wished to present offerings to her Majesty should transmit them through the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and he apprehended that, in the case which the hon. gentleman had mentioned, the functionary to whom he had referred had only acted as the Home Secretary would have done had he been applied to. The hon. member for Manchester had said that the movement against the aggression of the Papal Court was attributable to the bigotry of the Church of England, and that some few Dissenters had been deluded into joining them. He (Sir R. Inglis) thought it was greatly to the honour of the Dissenters that the two first petitions presented to that House on the subject now under discussion had been presented by the hon. member for Wolverhampton from two Dissenting bodies. The hon. member for Manchester had complained of what he called the salaries of the bishops and clergy of the Church of England. He (Sir R. Inglis) had repeatedly said, when similar statements had been made, that no salary was given by Parliament to the bishops or dignitaries of the Church of England, and that all that Parliament had done with reference to them had been to lessen the amount of hereditary property which they enjoyed. The hon. gentleman had complained of the income of 15,000*l.* a-year received by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but he begged to remind the hon. member that the

present archbishop received a much less amount than had been enjoyed by many of his predecessors. He (Sir R. Inglis) would not now enter upon the general question, but he would be ashamed of himself if, after the mention made on both sides of the House of the letter of the noble lord at the head of the Government, he did not thank his noble friend for that letter, for which he considered the Protestantism of this country and of Europe was largely indebted to the noble lord. He also begged to thank his noble friend for the speech he had delivered to-night. He wished he could give him equal thanks for the bill he had brought forward. He (Sir R. Inglis) could not but feel that there was too much truth in the statement that the bill would fall far short of the requirements of the case. He should not, however, do justice to the noble lord if he pronounced any decided opinion upon a measure which was not at present technically and formally before the House, and he would therefore reserve any observations he might wish to make until the bill had been introduced.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEBRUARY 10.

Mr. REYNOLDS commenced by stating, that he might call the difficulties which he had to encounter in discussing this question by the name of legion. In the first place, he had to contend with a gigantic and powerful opponent in the temporalities of the Established Church; and when he spoke of the Established Church he wished it to be understood as not referring to it in its spiritual capacity. With its spiritualities he had nothing to do, and he conceded freely to members of the Established Church the same privilege that he claimed for himself, of worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience. He believed, however, that it was to its temporalities all the insults that had been offered to his creed, and all the disturbances that had disgraced the character of certain persons during the last three months, were to be traced. What did he find? He found this gigantic Church Establishment, with its head in Canterbury, with its lithe leviathan body spread over England and Wales, one end resting on the Land's End and another grasping John O'Groats's house—for even in Scotland there were six bishops of the English Establishment assuming titles. He found the gigantic limbs of this Establishment crossing St. George's Channel, one spurred heel resting on Cape Clear, and the other on the Giant's Causeway. According to the calculation of the hon. member for Cockermouth (a very good judge), the revenues of the English Church were 5,000,000*l.* per annum, and there were 12,000 benefices. In Ireland, the revenues of the Established Church were about 500,000*l.*, with 1,500 benefices. In all, there were 15,000 ecclesiastics in England, and 2,500 in Ireland, with an income amounting to about 6,000,000*l.* a-year. Now, he would ask if that were not a formidable adversary to encounter. Then there was the press to contend with—not all the press, as the hon. member for Manchester had just reminded him, but the majority; there was the action of the press on the million, as exhibited at the Papal meetings. The press had acted upon the people—no, not upon the people—he was wrong there again, for the people had not been acted upon, though the Churchmen and the vestrymen had been acted upon, and had shouted to the top of their voices. In that shout, however, the Englishmen who earned their bread by the sweat of their brow had never joined. The truth was, the honest and sensible people of England had folded their arms, and said to themselves, "This is the Church's affair; it is a matter we have nothing to do with." The word "aggression" had been used by wholesale on this subject. Now, he found that, according to Johnson and other authorities, the word "aggression" meant "the beginning of a quarrel." He was told that his Holiness the Pope commenced the quarrel, but he totally denied it. It was the Church that began the quarrel, and the Pope did no more than he was entitled to do when he metamorphosed vicars-apostolic into bishops. It was absurd to say that the Pope, who was represented as the pettiest prince in Europe, could give territorial power to Cardinal Wiseman, or any other person. Aggression had been committed, but it was committed on the Catholics of England and Ireland by means of this bill. He maintained that this bill was an infraction of the agreement entered into with the Catholics when the Emancipation Act was passed in 1829. On Friday night the noble lord recommended the Catholic bishops now to follow the example of the bishops in 1829; but there was no analogy between the cases. In 1829, the Catholic bishops were receiving privileges, but now they had to thank the noble lord, not for privileges, but for penalties. They had been told of the line of conduct pursued by the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Camoys, and Lord Beaumont on this question. No man respected the duke more than he did, but in matters of religion he had much more respect for those from whom he received spiritual advice; and it was not to be expected that he should follow the example of any of those peers on the subject. But then there was also the hon. member for Youghal (Mr. Anstey). He said triumphantly, and was cheered to the echo, that there were two descriptions of Roman Catholics—they were the Catholics of the Church of Rome and the Catholics of the Court of Rome. Now he (Mr. Reynolds) had been educated from his infancy in the Catholic religion; he was not a convert; and he had never heard that there were two sections of Catholics. He should have thought that the word prevented the possibility of such a thing; but it occurred to him that if there were two sections of Catholics the hon. member for Youghal must belong to both. He found that he was a Catholic of the Court of Rome, for the late Pope Gregory XVI. conferred upon him the order of St. Gregory. He was, in fact, "the Hon. Sir Chisholm Anstey." The hon. member for Youghal was a lawyer, and he might find, perhaps, when he gave bad law, and that that law suited the public taste, that he would be considerably puffed in the newspapers. He said if the new hierarchy were allowed, it would establish the old Popish canon law in this country. Now, he challenged him to prove that to the satisfaction of any lawyer. He (Mr. Reynolds)

denied that it would have any such effect with regard to trusts and charities as the hon. member had pointed out. Would the hon. member for Youghal state to the House what services he rendered to the Pope in order to attain the honour conferred upon him? If he did not do so, perhaps he (Mr. Reynolds) would take the earliest opportunity of doing so. It was impossible to discuss this question without referring to the letter of the noble lord to the Bishop of Durham. He had a double right to refer to that letter, because it contained phrases not complimentary to his creed, and because by its publication he sustained a pecuniary loss. When he read that letter he said, "What! is it possible that the liberal, enlightened, consistent, and talented Prime Minister of England, the champion of civil and religious liberty in every country and in every clime; the man whom I have been taught to look up to as my political Whig leader, in the absence of a more thorough Liberal; he to whom I had given my undivided support since I entered the House of Commons, whenever I could with safety to my political conscience—is it possible that he has indited this epistle?" He happened to be speaking to one of his constituents, who said to him, "Well, Mr. Reynolds, have you seen the letter of your champion, Lord John Russell?" He (Mr. Reynolds) said "he had seen the noble lord's name at the bottom of a printed letter, but it doubtless was a hoax; it could not be genuine; the noble lord never could have written such a letter as that." His friend, who was a better, said, "I bet you a sovereign it is genuine." He (Mr. Reynolds) said, "Done!" He need not tell the House that he was "done," and that he had to pay the sovereign. The noble lord, in the course of his speech on Friday, said that all Churches were prone to make encroachments, but that the Roman Catholic Church was more disposed to do so than any other. Very likely that was the fact. There was not a Protestant in or out of the House that was more opposed to temporal encroachments by his own Church than he was; for he conscientiously believed that nothing would damage his creed more than that it should be connected with the State; and he was one of those who sincerely believed that the Pope of Rome ought not to be a temporal prince. But the question was quite a different one when they came to this side of the Channel. Here they had a mighty leviathan with its 6,000,000*l.* a-year and its 16,000 ecclesiastics, raising its head against every other establishment. The noble lord proposed to prevent vicars apostolic from calling themselves by the names of their sees in England, and then, he said, he intended to carry out the principle in Ireland. He supposed the noble lord did this from the love of uniformity. But the circumstances of England and Ireland were very different. In England the Catholics scarcely exceeded five per cent. of the population; while in Ireland they exceeded eighty per cent. of the population. In England there had been no Catholic hierarchy from the reign of Henry VIII. up to the present time; whereas in Ireland they had a chain of apostolical succession unbroken from the time of St. Patrick unto this hour; and it was for a Liberal Government, though that chain in the times of Toryism was never broken, to say that it should be broken now, not because the Catholic Church in Ireland had committed any offence, but in order to pander to the pride of an overgrown establishment in England. He had the honour last Saturday week of partaking of the hospitality of Lord Clarendon; and among the company were the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin and the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin—that, he supposed, would be called "Papal aggression;" but if any man had entered the room he would not have been able to discover that between those two dignitaries there was the least jealousy. It was "your Grace" here, and "your Grace" there, and all the compliments that the Viceroy could pay were paid to the two dignitaries of the two Churches. But, to return to the bill, it was said that this measure was to give satisfaction to the Catholics. Now, let the noble lord take the whole body of the Catholics of England, and, after deducting from them the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Camoys, Lord Beaumont, and some priest on the sea-coast, to whom the noble lord had referred the other night, he would venture to say that the whole of the Catholic barons were hostile to this measure. The honourable member for the city of Limerick considered the measure both inefficient and contemptible; but he (Mr. Reynolds) regarded it as neither inefficient nor contemptible, but that it was a measure of pains and penalties, and one calculated to inflict a wound upon the great principle of civil and religious liberty. It was a step backward, and he was ashamed that it should have been forced upon the House by a cabal that ought not to have been noticed. The people had been so blindfolded, and so misled, and so deceived by the agitators of the press and by agitators outside of the press, that many a member of that House who was then listening to him, and who was as much opposed to the bill as he was, would be compelled to vote for it, because he would risk losing his seat if he voted against it. The noble lord, therefore, must not estimate the opinion of the House by the number of votes he received, because he believed many might be coerced to support it whose consciences rebelled against the measure. He entered upon this discussion with great pain. He had hoped that persons of all religious persuasions would have been allowed to live together in peace. This agitation would do damage in Ireland, and would be a source of much discord and disunion, and many years must elapse before the country could be restored to a state of reconciliation and concord. It was his determination to offer the bill all the opposition in his power, and if it should pass (and he thought the chances were that it would pass in some shape), he would venture to prophecy that the bill would be a dead letter. He defied any Government to enforce its provisions, and if hon. gentlemen on the opposition side of the House were to assume their seats on the Treasury bench to-morrow, he defied them, with all their power, to carry out any penalties against his creed in his native country. The right hon. baronet the member for Ripon had said, on a former occasion, that Ireland was essentially a Catholic country. It was so, and he hoped he

should not be deemed guilty of uttering a bigoted phrase when he expressed a wish that it might ever remain so. What did the Catholics care for an Act of Parliament when it came in contact with their religion? The safety of their religion was in the purity of its doctrines and its poverty. The Catholic religion in Ireland was not clothed in purple and fine linen; it did not fare sumptuously every day; but it was clothed in sackcloth and ashes, and he hoped it would continue to be so. This agitation on the absurd cry of Papal aggression had postponed the consideration of all social questions. He was surprised that the thinking and educated people of England should have allowed themselves to be so deluded. He had been told that some Catholics would support this measure. He could understand Catholics in office voting for it; but he begged to remind them that a day of reckoning would come when they would be asked whether they were sent to the House of Commons to vote penal laws against Catholic bishops, and to tell a dying man who wished to leave 1,000*l.* to Dr. Murray for charitable purposes that if he called him the Most Rev. Daniel Murray Archbishop of Dublin, all his wishes would be frustrated, and that his money would pass to the Crown, to be given according to the will of the donor, or as the Crown should think fit. The noble lord said that Roman Catholics were promoted to places in the gift of the Government; but what was the fact? In the Court of Chancery, in Dublin, the number of Protestants employed was 75, whose salaries amounted to 57,000*l.* a-year; while the number of Catholics employed was only 17, and their salaries amounted to 4,000*l.* a year. In the law courts there were nine Protestant judges and 65 Protestant officers, whose salaries amounted to 54,719*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.*, while there were only three Catholic judges and 17 Catholic officers, with salaries amounting to 16,757*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.* The same principle existed in the Lord-Lieutenant's household, as well as in the Customs, Excise, Post-office, and all other public offices; and the only cure for all this, the only cup of comfort to be administered to the Catholics, was that their bishops should not be bishops with Irish titles. Dr. Cullen had been spoken of as one not acquainted with Ireland; whereas he was born, reared, and educated in that country, and was more extensively connected with the upper and middle classes than any other Catholic bishop. The noble lord laboured under similar mis-information with regard to Dr. Wiseman, whom the noble lord had called a foreigner; but he was to all intents and purposes a British subject. He was born of Irish parents at Seville, in Spain; lived there seven years, and then came and resided in his own native county of Waterford. (Loud laughter.) They all knew that a man born on board a British vessel at sea might call Sussex, Kent, or any other place his native county. (Renewed laughter.) The hon. gentleman concluded by disclaiming all sectarian or bigoted views, and declaring that, with reference to the Protestant Church, he entertained no feeling towards her but that of kindness and respect.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, that if the House had taken the usual and ordinary course of allowing this bill to be introduced at an early period, so that the House might become acquainted with its provisions, he should not have thought it his duty to trouble them with any observations at this stage; but, as they had not only been occupied one long night, but would probably be engaged for a similar period in a discussion with respect to a bill about to be introduced, in the absence of all knowledge as to its provisions—a species of ignorance which they must necessarily labour under—and, as it appeared to him that the observations made by his noble friend on introducing the bill, with respect to its purport and effect, had been misunderstood by the House, he was desirous of explaining what appeared to him to be the general scope and effect of the bill as described by his noble friend. But before he did so he hoped the House would permit him to call attention to what was the offence which it was intended by this bill to meet. It was to be observed that in the course of last year the offence consisted in the introduction of a bull, by which certain persons were entitled by the Pope of Rome to assume certain territorial sees and dioceses, defined by certain limits. That was the whole extent of the offence; the consequence of it would have to be regarded and dealt with by the House; but they were derived solely from the circumstance that those titles were authorised to be assumed as of certain pretended sees and dioceses of this country. The view he took, which was one he thought the House would agree in, was, that in meeting these consequences you should act on a very sound and safe maxim of politics, and that you ought not to introduce a remedy more extensive than was necessary to meet the evil complained of. He thought, therefore, if they introduced and passed a measure which should effectually prevent persons from holding those sees, as being bishops or archbishops of those pretended dioceses in England, that the real object which was sought would be found, and that they needed not to legislate beyond the occasion, or seek to provide against possible evils which had not yet arisen. Now, he believed the proposed bill would in fact effectually prevent the evils which had been complained of. That such was the object of the bill there was no question, and that it had been framed with considerable care to meet that object he was well assured—it would be for the House to consider with what success. He must be allowed to observe, that it was important to draw a distinction between the two different branches of the offence which would be constituted by the bill. One portion of it, a very large portion of it had relation to what was conceived by many, and, as he apprehended, justly conceived, to be an insult to this country; the other portion of it was the injury inflicted on certain classes of the inhabitants. But those two things were in themselves perfectly distinct. There had been this effect, that the insult offered to this country by a foreign power introducing a bull, by which he professed to govern the whole of the kingdom by his own immediate dependants, had produced an undue belief with respect

to the extent of the injury likely to arise from that bull; that the two things could not be separated in the public mind without some difficulty, and that a very great desire for Legislation had arisen, not merely from the injury it was suspected the introduction of the bull would cause, but in a great measure, by the insult which the public considered to have been offered to the Queen and to the country. As to the insult that had been offered, it would be useless to say anything. The expression of opinion on the part of the country and of the House was amply sufficient to show that the introduction of any measure containing an expression of their opinion would be fully adequate to repel, in the most proper and dignified manner, the insult which had been offered by the Court of Rome. With regard to the injury inflicted by the bull, it undoubtedly affected the Roman Catholic branches of the community, but it was, however, of a two-fold nature. The first injury was of a spiritual, the second was of a temporal character. With the first he apprehended they had nothing to do; and if it were possible for them to separate completely any questions with respect to the spiritual and temporal effect of the introduction of the bull, and the assumptions of titles thereupon, it would be well and fit for them to do so, apart from the question of what was due to the honour and dignity of the country. It was said the effect of the bull in temporal matters would be to give to certain persons assuming the titles of archbishops or bishops of dioceses and sees the power of dealing with appointments relating to religious endowments made by Roman Catholics; that it would enable them to deal with the property given to support charities, or for other religious purposes, in a different and more extensive manner than at present, and that the result would be to give to those prelates powers not intended to be conceded to them by the persons who founded those institutions. As to the spiritual power introduced, he had not heard it suggested, nor had he seen it in any of the publications he had read, that there were any specific powers which might be enforced by the bishops of these pretended sees, distinct or different from the powers which might have been enforced by the bishops *in partibus* and vicars-apostolic, or anything to show they were not as great in one case as in the other; but with respect to the temporal power, it was of importance, he apprehended, to stop the assumption by any person being, or pretending to be, as undoubtedly these bishops must profess themselves to be, under the canon law and dependant on the Pope of Rome, of dealing with the rights and interests of British subjects in a manner different from and inconsistent with the manner which had hitherto obtained. The difficulty to be feared would arise when the questions arising from these appointments came to be adjudicated upon by the courts of law, because the courts, taking cognisance of every species of endowment for the benefit of Roman Catholics, and enforcing trusts connected with them, would inquire into the rights of appointments as mere facts to be ascertained, and would refer to the authority of the Roman Catholic bishops to know by what authority the persons interested had been appointed. Now, the bill, as was stated by his noble friend (Lord J. Russell) on a former occasion, was intended in the first instance to extend the provisions of the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 10th George IV., which imposed a penalty of 100*l.* for every offence, in case of any Roman Catholic prelate assuming the title of any existing see throughout the United Kingdom, that penalty of 100*l.* to be enforced for every offence, but only sued for by the Attorney-General. Now, this bill, by the first section, extended the penalties of that clause to the case of the assumption of any title whatever—whatever it might be—from any city, or any town, or place, or territory, or district whatever within the United Kingdom. If the clause had been found to be effectual—a matter on which he could not profess to express any opinion—in preventing the assumption of the titles of existing sees, it might be equally expected to have a similar effect in preventing the assumption of titles from places within the United Kingdom. But it did not stop there. Several instances had been alluded to in which it was alleged that Roman Catholic bishops assumed the titles of existing sees, and it was thought desirable to endeavour to carry into effect the object of prohibiting the assumption of titles by making every act done by persons holding sees of that description, in their character of bishops or archbishops, null and void. It appeared to him that any clause providing that any act whatever, or any deed, instrument, or writing made or executed by or to any one assuming such titles, or done in the character of assuming them, should be null and void, would have the effect of completely paralysing, with respect to his temporal authority, all the powers of any person thus claiming to be a bishop, and that it would not be possible for him to do anything which would be effectual in a court of justice for the enforcement of any religious or charitable trust or use; for as the Act of Parliament declared any deed by a person in that position to be void, it could not be given in evidence or proved, so as to enable any one in his quality of bishop to do that which, if done in any other character, would be perfectly valid. In addition to that, they proposed to endeavour to prevent other persons giving those bishops of pretended sees titles from any place in the United Kingdom, and they therefore proposed to enact that it should not be lawful for any one to endow or to give any sum of money whatever for the support of such dioceses or sees, or to any person performing ecclesiastical functions, as such, of such districts, and words sufficiently large would be introduced to provide against any evasion of these provisions. They further provided, that every devise of real or personal property given to any person by his title, as derived from any diocese or see, should, in point of fact, be forfeited to the Crown, and that the Crown should be able to dispose of it in such manner as should be thought fit. The effect of that would be, that it would be totally impossible for any person

intending to give any grant for charitable purposes, of which the bishop or archbishop of the diocese was to be the administrator, to give it to him by the name or with reference to the name of his diocese. Undoubtedly it was not intended to prevent any person making any beneficial bequest to any Roman Catholic; the only thing was, that in doing so he must give it by the name in which the donee usually went, and that, for example, he must give it to Dr. Wiseman, not to Dr. Wiseman Archbishop of Westminster, as, if given by the latter name, it would be void, and the money would be disposable by the Crown. The House would see, therefore, that if it was intended to make a beneficial bequest, it would be properly given by the name of the person who was to receive it; that, if it was a charitable bequest, it could not be given except by some name which betokened succession in a certain corporate character, but if it was given as spiritual bequests had been given to vicars-apostolic, it would be perfectly good for charitable purposes for the time being, and would be enforced by the courts of law. They had also endeavoured to prevent in any way all evasions of the bill from the bequest being given to any person in connexion with the bishop, or by reference to any particular see, or to the person who held it or any person appointing to an office within it, and, if any such bequest were made, it would have to be disposed of by the Crown, it not being possible for the person himself to dispose of it consistently with the law. It was thought more desirable there should be a forfeiture to the Crown than to make the bequest absolutely void, because there might be cases in which, from accident or ignorance, a bequest might be made to some of the relatives of a prelate, when it would not be proper to annul the deed, and when it was right to enable the Crown to grant it to the person intended. That was, in effect, the general scope and ground of the bill, and it would, as he thought the House would see, effectually prevent persons from assuming titles from places in the United Kingdom, and the existence of territorial dioceses or sees. The case referred to by the hon. and learned member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck,) of an archbishop at, in, or near Westminster, would come precisely within the meaning of the bill, if it could be shown that those words by the context had any reference to the giving of the title. Undoubtedly, in ordinary parlance, it was true that Archbishop Musgrave, when sitting in the House of Peers, was Archbishop in Westminster, and in the same way hon. members in that House were members in Westminster, though only one could be member for Westminster; but the fact of the person claiming the pretended diocese residing therein would give him no authority or title whatever. It had been said the bill would not interfere with synodical action of the Roman Catholic prelates, but he differed from that opinion, and thought it would be the necessary consequence of the bill that this action would be interfered with. It was desirable to effect that object in the most quiet manner possible, but, if it was effectually done, it was all the House should seek to do, and they should rest content with provisions suited to the occasion. It was said, again, that they did not deal with the particular case of a Roman Catholic priest or prelate, by menaces and the terrors of eternal punishment, inducing a person to forego the performance of several duties and rights which otherwise he would have done. For instance, it was said the Roman Catholic prelates might promulgate some resolution to meet in a synod like that of Thurles, and require the clergy to threaten to deny the sacraments to any one who enlisted in the British army or gave evidence in a British court of justice. That was possible, but it would not be proper to introduce such a question when there was no reason for it nor any likely to arise, and he had no hesitation in saying that if such a question did arise it would be an offence at common law, and he had no doubt the courts of common law would be found sufficiently strong to punish it. It was therefore desirable they should not attempt to meet cases where persons were terrified by their spiritual instructors, as they were not cases legislation could touch, because, unless they came before the courts of law, they were matters which were secret between the victim and the person who afforded him spiritual instruction. To illustrate his meaning by the instance already referred to by his noble friend, where the sacraments were refused to a Minister in Piedmont, it was obvious that if he had been terrified, and had consented to violate his conscience, and to say he repented of an act of which he really approved, he would have obtained the sacraments of the Church; and it was the fact that he had not done so, and had died without them, that made the circumstances notorious. In all such cases, then, they must appeal to the good sense and judgment of the Roman Catholic body, who would resist the oppression of the Roman Catholic clergy whenever the latter were disposed to enforce it. He appealed with very great confidence to the Roman Catholic laity in this country, and he felt that in legislating on this question they were bound to consider that body as being in all respects, with the one exception of spiritual matters, in the same situation as themselves, animated by a sincere desire for the welfare of the country, and for the preservation of order and good government. When, then, they thought it necessary to introduce a measure of this description, it was not merely for the protection of the Protestants, but it was, he conscientiously believed, not less for the protection of the Roman Catholic laity. He believed that a large body of them felt in the same way, but he believed they were so bound down by their religion, by party feeling, and by a regard for the honour of their Church, that they were not able fully to express their feelings as to the advantages which would arise from the measure. For his own part, he would have been better pleased if the necessity for it had never arrived, and if the question itself had never arisen. He must say, he thought there could be little question as to whom the bill would satisfy. It could not

satisfy those who said—no doubt perfectly conscientiously—they did not believe any injury had been inflicted by the introduction of the bull. These hon. gentlemen conscientiously objected to any legislation, though it was possible many of them thought the Pope would have acted more properly if he had expressed his intention to introduce a bull of that kind to the State and to the country. As to those who looked upon the question in a political light, and who made a handle of it for the purpose of embarrassing the present Government, they could argue the bill was either too strong, or that it was not strong enough, and so it would be impossible to satisfy them; but with respect to that larger portion of the House who really and sincerely felt an injury had been done which ought to be redressed, he said that the measure before them was a fit and proper measure for the purpose for which it had been intended. The Roman Catholics had always professed their desire to obey the law, and had asserted, he doubted not with truth, that they were actuated by the same feelings of loyalty as their Protestant fellow-subjects. Was it not a fit and proper thing, then, that they should obey a measure of this description—a measure which made it an offence by statute law to take titles from any place in the kingdom, or to administer any property with reference to those titles? He believed the House would find the Roman Catholics would not resist it; and, admitting that there was great danger in making prophesies on political questions, he thought he was safe in saying so. He thought it was but fair to give them an opportunity of seeing whether they would not obey the law which would be established, and he felt satisfied that if they did not obey the law, and that if it should be necessary to take more stringent measures, the power of Parliament would be found to be of the strongest kind, and could easily make a measure which would amply meet the question. He did not think there would be any necessity for such a measure. He felt great regret that so rash and ill-advised a step had been taken as that which rendered the bill necessary—a step which could have no beneficial tendency to the Roman Catholic religion, and which might affect many of the Roman Catholic laity; but at the same time he had perfect confidence that the Roman Catholic laity would be found disposed to aid every measure which was found essential for the due administration of the law, and which was designed not only for the protection of Protestantism, but, as he believed, for the protection of themselves against an undue assumption of temporal power.

Lord ASHLEY said, that however desirable it might be to approach this question with great calmness and deliberation, they who entertained a very serious conviction respecting its importance must approach it with decision and resolution equal to the emergency. The question was, whether they would allow the ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome to seize upon and to occupy in these realms a position they never occupied in the most palmy days of Romanism in this country, and which they did not occupy, and never would be permitted to occupy, in any of the continental nations which owned the authority of the Vatican. He must say it was not a question merely affecting the Church of England; it was no bill to secure her Establishment, to affect her honour, or to extend her influence. The question really was, would they or would they not give that protection to the civil and religious liberty of the country which it required? The question affected the Wesleyans, the Baptists, the Independents—in short, Dissenters of all denominations, as much as it affected the Church of England, and he believed they could prove it affected as much the liberty of the Roman Catholics themselves, and most undoubtedly the liberty of the inferior orders of the Roman Catholic clergy. He had been very much astonished to hear the hon. member for Manchester (Mr. Bright) say that no Dissenting congregation north of London had taken any part in this movement. Perhaps he might there be allowed to express the admiration he entertained for the conduct of the Dissenters, who had agreed to cast aside their various differences, and to withhold their assaults on the State Church for the purpose of making common cause against the common enemy. When he heard the hon. member for Manchester say no movement had been made by Dissenters north of the metropolis, he (Lord Ashley) could not but recollect that most remarkable document called "The declaration of the ministers of the congregational denominations in the county of Lancaster," written, he should think, by that great master of the English language, Dr. Vaughan, of Moorside. The whole would repay perusal, for it was one of the clearest and most able statements of the position of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches he had ever read. He would read one extract:—

"In all this we see Romanism in a form the most despotic, arrogant, and offensive, strikingly in contrast to the more liberal interpretations of it so common among English Catholics before the passing of the Emancipation Act—in a form, indeed, which is so much after the pattern of the worst times in the history of the Papacy, as to furnish precedent enough, if allowed silently to take its course, for aggressions dangerous alike to the British Crown and to those liberties, civil and religious, which our Protestant fathers have bequeathed to us."

Was not that an emphatic declaration from Dissenters living north of the metropolis? Did it not prove very remarkably that the Nonconformists of the present day inherited the spirit of their Nonconformist ancestors of old, and that they were no more to be wheedled by the soft blandishments of Cardinal Wiseman than by the smooth words of James II. when he meditated against the spiritual liberty of the country? As far as he had been able to follow the arguments against the proposition, they were divisible into several classes. The first, the weakness of the power they were called on to resist; but was not "weakness" to be considered a relative term? Was not the power which wielded such influence in spiritual matters stronger in moral force than all other powers, and was it not possible that when the Pope was so insecure as to be trembling for his existence he might be able to stir remote kingdoms and to dethrone monarchs, and that, though he might not have a soldier

or a gunboat, he could put in operation half the force of the kingdoms of Christendom? When he was in his lowest condition, was he not able to rouse the armies of France, of Austria, of Naples, and of Spain for his defence? But in speaking of the movement now made, and on which the bill was founded, as a movement dictated by fear—it was not that England entertained the slightest fear for all the political, physical, or spiritual force that could be leagued against her, that she had moved in the matter; but because it was a great and intolerable insult, and must be redressed. If it had been contained in a mere writing, an empty manifesto, it might have passed without notice; but it was an insult reduced to practice, and embodied in the presence and existence of twelve bishops, who, by their personal appearance in this country, day after day, kept the Queen constantly informed that she was not the fountain of honour in this realm, and who, by the distribution of her kingdom into districts and provinces, gave her to understand she was not supreme governor in her own dominions. The next argument used against the bill was that a man might assume any name he pleased. He should like to hear the opinion of the Attorney-General on that point. He did not believe a man might assume what name he pleased, and make regulations in that name to bind others. The main argument, however, was, that the bill was a restriction on religious liberty, and that it was a limitation on that liberty which had been carried by the act of 1829. Now, he was prepared to say for himself, and he was sure he might say the same for a vast body outside the House—of course he could not answer for any within—that he had no desire whatever to intrench in the least on the privileges which had been granted by the act of 1829. The question was not whether we should take from the Roman Catholics, but whether we should allow them to take anything from us. The question was whether the late Papal movement was inconsistent with the rights of the Crown, and the civil and religious liberties of all subjects of this realm? We were not the aggressors. We did not begin the movement. A foreign potentate and priest, by a certain document—whether legal or illegal he would not then pause to inquire—had, without permission of our Sovereign, without any communication whatever with the Government of this country, divided the realm into provinces and dioceses, appointed to them his own nominees, and invested them with territorial titles. The advocates of this proceeding said that it was altogether in keeping with the spirit of the act passed in 1829, and that it was necessary for the free development of the Roman Catholic religion. Surely upon this statement there arose two questions: first, was this proceeding necessary to the development of the Roman Catholic religion; and, secondly, was it consistent with the rights of the Crown, and the civil and religious liberties of all the people of this country? He would not pause to discuss the tone and temper of the apostolic brief—for brief it was, if the Attorney-General, who called it a bull, would allow himself to be corrected on that point. With respect to the first proposition, that the recent act of the Pope was necessary for the development of the Roman Catholic religion, he must observe that, looking to the act of 1829, it was perfectly clear that the Roman Catholics had full right and privilege to develop their religion, to diffuse, extend, and promote it by all legitimate means in their power. He would even go further, and say, that although their Church had been governed in these realms for nearly 300 years by vicars-apostolic, yet, episcopal functions being necessary to the government of the Roman Catholic Church, he believed—as at present advised—that they had full power to convert their vicars-apostolic into bishops. He knew perfectly well the detriment we should receive from the constitution of such a hierarchy; but, nevertheless, it appeared to be in conformity with the concessions made in 1829. But no one had proved, or attempted to prove, and it was his firm belief that no one was able to prove, that territorial titles were in any degree necessary to the exercise of episcopal functions. A territorial title was a worldly and material affair. The office of bishop was a spiritual concern altogether. Would any one venture to assert that Archbishop Wiseman could not exercise, within the jurisdiction assigned to him, archiepiscopal functions, unless he were called Archbishop of Westminster? It was, he knew, said that bishops of the Roman Catholic Church must have a local habitation and a name. Granted. Then, why did not Dr. Wiseman call himself Archbishop of the Roman Catholics in Westminster? (Some laughter.) Let not hon. members who laughed be in such a hurry. If they would be patient and give him their attention, he would show them—he would not promise to their satisfaction, but to that of a good many—that the difference adverted to, however minute in appearance, was mighty in operation. Why did not Dr. Wiseman call himself Archbishop of the Roman Catholics in Westminster—a title which would leave him at liberty to discharge his archiepiscopal functions, and yet assign his true distinction and impose on him a just limitation? Many persons said, “Why be so particular about names—why fight with a mere shadow? What can it signify whether a man be called archbishop *in* or *of* a particular place? Is a monosyllable to throw the whole empire into confusion? Yes, it was, and it ought. In the first place, the title of Archbishop of Westminster claimed universal jurisdiction, whilst the title of Archbishop of the Roman Catholics in Westminster showed clearly that it was a restricted office. Let him, in the first place, bring forward, by way of testimony and illustration, what we did in our own case when we thought it desirable to send a Protestant bishop of the English Church to the holy city of Jerusalem. We did not, as Dr. Wiseman stated in his pamphlet, erect a bishopric there; we merely sent a bishop from this country to be resident in Jerusalem for Protestant purposes; but, so careful were we to observe the rule laid down, that persons should not assume territorial titles and jurisdiction where they had no right to do so, that, in the first place, her Majesty’s Government obtained from the Sovereign of the country a firman allowing the bishop to reside there; and, in the second place, we took care, in the deed of consecration, to

give him the title of "Alexander Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, resident in Jerusalem." Such was the caution observed by us when we sent a bishop to Jerusalem. But as to the value of names and titles we had the testimony of whole nations, and that was a matter not to be lightly thrown aside. It would be in the recollection of the House that when, in 1830, a revolution took place in the affairs of France, Louis Philippe was raised to the throne; but he was raised to it on this condition—imposed by the whole French people—that he should not be called King of France, but simply King of the French. We had then the testimony of the whole French nation that a great distinction may be involved in what might at first sight appear to be a simple difference in the form of expression. A similar course was pursued when Prince Leopold was raised to the throne of Belgium. The same condition was imposed in that case, and he was called the King of the Belgians, not the King of the Belgian territory. But the strongest argument of all was to be found in the estimate which the Roman Catholics themselves put on the title. Do you suppose that if, in their apprehension, there was nothing real and solid in the difference between the title of Archbishop of Westminster and Archbishop of the Roman Catholics in Westminster, they would have exposed themselves to the indignation and resentment of a whole country, and to the introduction of legislative measures to prevent the assumption of the chosen title? It was because they knew the name was of value that they insisted on the title with unprecedented pertinacity. Here was the reason Cardinal Wiseman—for a cardinal he certainly was, it being a foreign title—in his famous "Appeal," when defending himself against the charge of ambition for having assumed a territorial title, assigned the true reason, and so important was the reason he assigned, that one was almost inclined to believe he had heard our prayer, "Oh that my enemy would write a book!" Cardinal Wiseman stated, then, that the Roman Catholic bishops did not take restrictive titles because the Church of Rome did not, and never would, allow any limitation to her jurisdiction. And why not? For this reason:—It was a well-known tenet of the Church of Rome, as nobody would deny, that every baptised soul, whether baptised by a layman or an ecclesiastic; whether in the Roman Catholic Church or out of it, in whatever way baptised, was subject to the authority of the Pope of Rome. To state, therefore, that Dr. Wiseman was Archbishop only of the Roman Catholics in Westminster would be to restrict his name and jurisdiction, while to call him the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster preserved to him the full demand of his Church to inalienable sovereignty. But that very demand was one to which Protestants should offer an uncompromising and undying resistance. It was in accordance with the well-known policy of the Church of Rome that everything which was not resisted she converted into a right, and made it the starting point for fresh aggrandizement, and a fresh exercise of her unwarrantable ambition. Then, with respect to the second question—namely, was the Pope's proceeding consistent with the rights of the Crown and the civil and religious liberties of the people of England, Dr. Wiseman again should answer, and by his own showing it would appear that it was not compatible with the liberties of this realm. Dr. Wiseman said that the introduction of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was not simply for diocesan purposes, but with the view of obtaining synodical action. He (Lord Ashley) would not pause to show what might be the effect of synodical action. That had been sketched in a graphic manner by the noble lord at the head of the Government, when he described the serious consequences which had resulted from the Synod of Thurles. What had been done at Thurles would be repeated in Westminster, and we should have an ecclesiastical empire sitting here and issuing decrees in the very heart of the metropolis of the British dominions. That was not all. The institution of the hierarchy was required for synodical action, but synodical action was required for the introduction of the canon law. Those were the words of Dr. Wiseman himself. Had the House considered the nature and character of the canon law? Had they reflected on what they had heard on this subject from the lips of members of the Roman Catholic body, namely, that it laid burdens on them which were not easy to bear? The House had heard what had fallen from one of its Roman Catholic members. They knew the Duke of Norfolk had declared that the ultramontane system sought to be established in England was inconsistent with the constitution, and that Lord Beaumont had stated that,—

"The Pope, by his ill-advised measures, has placed the Roman Catholics in this country in a position where they must either break with Rome, or violate their allegiance to the constitution of these realms."

That was the condition in which many Roman Catholics, and in which all the country would be placed, by the introduction of the territorial hierarchy. With respect to synodical action, it should be borne in mind that we did not allow it in our own Church, and, that being the case, were we to be called upon to allow it to a rival and hostile Church? But to revert to the canon law. He would not have called the attention of the House to the provisions of the canon law had it not been avowed that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was established for the purpose of introducing that code which would be binding on the consciences of a large portion of the community. Again, he asked, had the House considered whether the canon law was compatible with the civil law of this country—whether it would not be necessary for those who obeyed it to place themselves frequently in opposition to the civil law of the realm?

* * * For continuation of Debate see next Number, Series XXI., now ready.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

PAPAL AGGRESSION.—HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEB. 10, 1851.

(Continuation of Debate from the Twentieth Series.)

Lord ASHLEY continued—To show the character of the canon law, he could not do better than quote a great and impartial authority—one of the first historians of modern times—Mr. Hallam. In the “Middle Ages” of that writer the following passage was to be found:—“The superiority of the ecclesiastical over the temporal power may be considered as a sort of keynote which regulates every passage in the canon law. It is expressly declared that subjects owe no allegiance to an excommunicated Sovereign.” He would not stop to point out the terrible expressions which were to be found in the canon law with reference to spiritual matters, because with them the House had nothing to do; but perhaps he might be permitted to read two or three citations from that law, which Mr. Hallam had appended to the chapter of his book. “The laws of kings have not pre-eminence over ecclesiastical laws, but are subordinate to them. To the succeeding passage he requested the attention of the Attorney-General:—“The statute-law of laymen does not extend to churches, or to ecclesiastical persons, or to their goods, to their prejudice.” That this was no idle declaration was proved by the present conflict between Sardinia and the Pope. What had caused the dissension but the determination of the Sardinian Government to set aside the canon law, and make all ecclesiastical persons subject to the civil law of the realm? Because the Sardinian Minister Santa Rosa wished merely to put the law of his country on the same footing as that of France and Austria he was deprived by the priests of the last sacrament, and, had it not been for the indignation of the people, he would have been altogether deprived of Christian burial. To proceed with Mr. Hallam’s citations from the canon law:—“Whatever decrees of princes are found injurious to the interests of the Church are declared to be of no authority whatever.” “While a Sovereign remains excommunicated his subjects owe him no allegiance; and, if he do not submit himself to the Church, his subjects are absolved from all fealty to him.” Then came a part of the canon law which applied to all matters between man and man of which a court of justice could take cognisance. The decretal of Gregory states, “Oaths that are disadvantageous to the interests of the Church are not to be considered as oaths, but rather as perjuries.” Let him not be misunderstood; he quoted these things, not as against the Roman Catholic body, and he would not have quoted them at all had he not been told that the canon law was about to be introduced for the first time into England. Under these circumstances it behoved us to know what that code was, and to ascertain, and speedily determine, whether it was compatible with our civil and religious liberties. Let him not be answered by phrases about “the nineteenth century,” and the “march of intellect.” Was it not remarkable that in this nineteenth century, during the march of intellect, and in the course of the last few years, when the greatest stimulus had been given to the human mind, a larger number of persons had gone over to the Church of Rome than during the preceding 300 years? So little had the march of intellect availed to stem the advance of Popery. Let us reverse the picture, and make the case our own. Suppose her Majesty, in compliance with the wishes of her Protestant subjects residing in the Italian States, had appointed bishops of Civita Vecchia and Ancona, or, to make the case more in point, had divided Rome into districts, and appointed a bishop of Trastevere. In such a case it was easy to imagine how the noble lord at the head of Foreign Affairs would have been besieged by protocols and conferences by the Ministers of France, Austria, and Spain. And yet, if her Majesty had done that, she would have done no more than had been done in this country by the intolerable ambition of the Pope of Rome. The hon. member for Sheffield had referred to America, and said, that there the Pope’s proceedings would have been viewed with indifference. The cases of the two countries were not analogous. America was a confederation of States. In America Romanism had never been established—it had no Established Church—no antecedents of history on which to rely—nor was it possible to establish the Romish system there. The Romanists in America set to work very differently. They did not put themselves forward prominently in New York and Philadelphia, but were engaged very actively in founding colonies in the far west, and converting new settlers as they arrived. This was not said in disparagement of the Roman Church; on the contrary, he thought its zeal worthy of commendation; and if the Protestant Churches of Christendom would exhibit the same amount of zeal the Protestant faith would soon spread over the whole earth. The hon. gentleman had quoted the instance of the Wesleyans. But did the Wesleyans owe a divided allegiance? Had they joined any foreign connexion? Did they issue

spiritual censures? It was perfectly true that they divided and subdivided the country into districts for their own purposes and convenience; but if the President of the Conference, having sub-divided the country for the convenience of the Wesleyan ministers, were to make known what he had done in a "pastoral" such as hon. members had lately read, and were to say that he "governed" the counties of Lancaster, York, and Cumberland, and would continue to "govern" them as President of the Conference, he (Lord Ashley) really thought that the next thing they would hear of him would be that he had been under the hands of a medical man, and had been declared a person of unsound mind under the terms of the Lunatic Act, and was a fit and proper subject for confinement. There was another aspect in which this question might be viewed; but, although it was a very painful one, it was one of such vital importance that he could not in his conscience discuss a measure for the purpose of resisting the Papal aggression without bringing his views upon it before the House, because he knew they were not only his, but the views of a very large mass of the laity of these realms. Was there nothing that had invited aggression in the state of our own unhappy divisions? Was there nothing within ourselves that had invited the attack from without? And when we were proceeding to discuss measures that should repel external aggression, ought we not to examine carefully, and see whether or not there existed among ourselves something that had invited the aggression and would continue to invite similar aggressions in an increased and an increasing degree? He begged to read to the House an extract which he was quite sure they would find worthy of their utmost attention. It contained the words of a person of great authority upon this question—the words not of some Low Churchman attacking the Tractarians—the words not of some man attached to the Genevan platform who was writing in bitterness against the episcopate—but the words of a person of great authority who, with his eagle eyes, had, from the mountain top, examined what was going forward, and had come down to tell us what he had seen. Speaking of the Church of England, he said:—

"It may seem necessary to state my reason for imagining that I see an approximation, not merely towards individual Catholic practices or doctrines, but towards Catholic union. . . . It seems to me impossible to read the works of the Oxford divines, and especially to follow them chronologically, without discovering a daily approach towards our holy Church, both in doctrine and affectionate feeling. Our saints, our popes, have become dear to them by little and little; our rites and ceremonies, our offices, nay, our very rubrics, are precious in their eyes; far, alas! beyond what many of us consider them; our monastic institutions, our charitable and educational provisions, have become more and more objects with them of earnest study. . . . Their admiration of our institutions and practices, and their regret at having lost them, manifestly spring from the value which they set on everything Catholic."

A little further on he said—

"That the feelings which have been expressed in favour of a return to unity by the Anglican Church are every day widely spreading, and deeply sinking, no one can doubt. Those sentiments have a silent echo in hundreds of sympathising bosoms. . . . There are many evidences (which it would be hardly proper to detail) that Catholic feelings have penetrated deeper into society than at first one would suspect. Whole parishes have received the leaven, and it is fermenting; and places where it might least be expected seem to have received it in more secret and mysterious ways."

Was there no temptation here? The writer might have been misinformed; but he stated that such was his belief, and certainly external appearances fully warranted it. [An observation, which we did not catch, was here made by an hon. member under the opposite gallery—Mr. Philip Howard, we believe.] If the hon. gentleman would be good enough to attend to the words of the extract, he (Lord Ashley) thought he would bow his head in reverence when he knew who wrote them. The writer concluded thus:—

"By two ways the population of this country would be worked upon (through its Established Church) for its moral improvement—the rural districts through parochial influence; the denser population of towns or manufacturing districts through monastic institutions. Experience has now shown that the country population are ready to receive without murmuring, indeed, with pleasure, the Catholic views propounded from Oxford; and, indeed, even more, when taught through regular parochial instruction."

This was written in 1841, and was signed, "Nicholas Wiseman, Bishop of Melipontanus." Was there nothing here to invite aggression? Was there nothing here to invite the hope that, if the Romish Church would only put on a bold front, and make a vigorous effort, a large proportion of the people of these realms were ready to embrace the Roman communion? But there was another point to which he wished to allude. He wished to speak with all respect of the clerical gentlemen who had signed the important document to which he was about to refer; but he would ask whether such an act as that was not enough to lead the Romish Court to the belief that a very large proportion of the clergy of the English Church was well affected to the Romish communion? Last year, 1,800 clergymen of the Church of England, most of them holding benefices, signed a declaration against the Royal supremacy. He doubted not that they acted in full accordance with their conscientious opinions; but, nevertheless, although they put the document forth without explanation, the leading fact was that the Royal supremacy,

which had been recognised for 300 years, was at last called in question by 1,500 clergy-
men having congregations upon whom they could inculcate their opinions. Now this,
he thought, was an act sufficient to induce the Court of Rome to believe there was the
greatest sympathy in the Church of England with the doctrines, discipline, and tenets of
the Church of Rome. When he added to this the very practices which had been intro-
duced by many of the clergy, the processions, the auricular confessions, and ten thousand
other things that approximated so closely to the doctrines and discipline of the Church
of Rome; when he added also the fact, that the Bishop of London thought it his duty
to condemn "the histrionic" ceremonies which were practised in his diocese—ceremonies
which, while they indicated a panting after those of Rome, were, after all, but a mis-
erable imitation of them—he could not avoid the conclusion that there was something
within our own borders which had invited, and would continue to invite, the aggressions
of the Roman Pontiff. He might be allowed to say that, if these things were allowed to
continue, there would arise, and at no distant time, a collision between the ecclesiastics
and the laity, the issue of which could not be doubtful to any reflecting mind. He
asserted, nevertheless, that the laity loved their Church, its doctrines, its discipline, its
parochial system; that they desired to maintain its orders of bishop, presbyter, and
deacon, in all their efficiency and all their dignity; but they would maintain it in purity,
and not in corruption. To obtain this end, they would, under God's blessing, incur
every hazard, try every alternative, and shrink from no consequences whatever, in their
endeavours to bring back the Church that they loved still nearer and nearer to the
standard of the glorious Reformation.

Mr. GRATTAN wished to know whether the Government intended to establish an army of
spies in the country, who, for the sake of the 100l. penalties, would turn informers against the
Catholic hierarchy? He begged to tell them that this was a land of liberty; and that it
was impossible that an act like this should pass. Why, too, he would like to know, did they
seek to punish Ireland for an offence committed in England? The Pope had committed no
aggression in Ireland. He begged also to tell them that the 28th of Henry VIII., the 13th of
Elizabeth, c. 1 and 2, and the other penal acts against Catholics, which had been referred to
in the course of this discussion, never had been law in Ireland. The recent act of the Pope
was called an aggression; but it was no more an aggression than the appointments of vicars-
apostolic in 1841 was. It was said to be an insult to her Majesty. Did her Majesty not pre-
viously know that a great portion of her subjects were Roman Catholics, and did she not also
know that they were governed by the Pope, and not by her, as far as their spiritual affairs
were concerned? But it was said that the Pope had changed the names of the bishops and
given them territorial titles. It was absurd to quarrel about titles, and the noble lord opposite
(Lord Ashley) had talked about nothing else till he came to the Puseyites. Besides, it
was too late in the day to complain of the titles of the Catholic bishops; for they had
already been recognised both by Parliament and the Government, in the Charitable Bequests
Act, in the Dublin Cemeteries Act, in Lord Grey's letter, in Lord Clarendon's letter, and in the
orders of the Lord Chamberlain. He should direct the attention of the House (and he proposed
to do so very briefly) to the speech of the hon. member for Surrey. As a freeholder of that
county he was entitled to call that hon. gentleman his representative; and he therefore thought
himself more particularly entitled to allude to the observations which he made in that House.
Now, he was quite astonished at the speech which his hon. representative had made in the
course of the present debate. The House would recollect that he came down with a ponde-
rous budget of documents attacking the past and the present. It might be, perhaps, too
much for one who was not a lawyer to say that the words of that speech might subject him
to an action at law, but he really believed they went far enough for that purpose. He called
Archbishop Cullen a spy, and another bishop he called a scoundrel. That was very extraor-
dinary language for any one to hold in Parliament. It might do very well in the county of
Surrey, but not in the House of Commons. He (Mr. Grattan) was enabled to speak in the
highest terms of the character of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, who was a native of the county
with which he was immediately connected. He had met Dr. Cullen both at home and
abroad, and he had ever found him in every point worthy of the highest respect, so that he
trusted the House would pay very little attention to that part of the speech of the hon.
member for Surrey which was founded on the accusations that he brought against the Roman
Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. In an equal degree did he think they ought to disregard the
distinction which the hon. member sought to establish between the Court of Rome and the
Church of Rome. He repeated that he well knew Dr. Cullen, that he had met him not only
in his own county of Meath but at Rome, when he (Mr. Grattan) had an opportunity of
knowing the sentiments of the late Pope Gregory XVI., and the only fault he had to find with
that pontiff was that, for one placed in his position, he showed too great a leaning towards
the English Government. If he had been one of the advisers of Pope Gregory he should
have recommended him not to believe one-half of what was told him by the English
Government. There was no part of the conduct of that Pope, or of Dr. Cullen, which would
not bear the strictest scrutiny. The hon. member for Surrey was deceived in the whole of this
matter; but he knew how he was deceived—not wilfully, but he was deceived by one who came
to the county of Surrey meeting from the retirement of his study, and he there said much
that was not consistent with what he had said and written on previous occasions. That eminent
and learned person, in the year 1841, being then Lord Chancellor of Ireland, directed an in-

quiry to be instituted in the case of a charitable trust, and in the report made on that subject, and received and sanctioned by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, the Most Rev. Dr. Crolly was styled Archbishop of Armagh, and Roman Catholic Primate of all Ireland. But they had not only a recognition of Roman Catholic episcopal titles by that Lord Chancellor, but by a noble and learned person, now Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in England. Lord Campbell (in his "Lives of the Chief Justices") spoke of the Most Rev. Oliver Plunket as the Roman Catholic Primate of all Ireland; and were they now, in the bill then under consideration, to introduce a clause preventing the booksellers issuing such a work as the writings of Lord Campbell? Surely no one supposed that the peace of the country would be disturbed by the circulation of such compositions. He would now ask, was the Pope the only offender in such cases as the present, was he the only person who appointed bishops in a foreign country? Would they not be reduced to the most ridiculous of all positions if they denied the right of appointing Protestant bishops, for example, and clergymen, in Roman Catholic countries? What had the Pope done but that which was done under the 5th of Victoria, which was an act to amend the 29th of George III., enabling the Archbishop of Canterbury to send out Protestant clergymen to foreign countries—countries in which the Sovereign of England had no power or any claim of authority? Surely they would not be told that a thing was right when done by the Queen and wrong when done by the Pope. The case of America had frequently been referred to in the course of the present discussion, and the opinions of the Americans on the subject of toleration were well known; but he could not help reminding them of what took place at the celebration of the late anniversary of the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers on that continent, a celebration at which the British Ambassador was present, and at which Mr. Webster observed, quoting from "Junius," that the early settlers left their native land in search of liberty, and found it in a desert; and, however divided they might be on many questions of deep interest, they were agreed in equally detesting the pageantry of a king and the supercilious hypocrisy of a bishop. It was further said by Mr. Webster that at the head of the judicature of the great Republic they had now a Roman Catholic judge, in whom the citizens of America reposed the highest confidence—they were not the people to question a man's ability or integrity on the ground of his being a Roman Catholic. The truth was, there was a power behind the Treasury bench greater than the bench itself; and if it were to continue to make itself felt, he said, "Remove the Ministry, and place them on the other side of the House." If the noble lord continued to act in opposition to Irish feelings, not only upon this question, but with respect to the abolition of the Viceroyalty and other such matters, then he said, "Down with Lord J. Russell and up with the name and character of the country!" What was the state of Ireland when this affair happened? Peace was returning; parties were becoming united in the common bonds of their country. And were these new ties to be severed by the Government measure? The noble lord told them the other night of one of the Queen's titles. She was, he reminded them, "by the grace of God," Queen of these realms. But the noble lord forgot another title, viz., that she was Queen "by the love of her people." That was as good a title as the other. Charles I. was King "by the grace of God;" and much good it did him when he was beheaded. James II. was King "by the grace of God;" and much good it did him when he was turned out of the country and lost his crown. But we had now a Sovereign who was Queen as well by the grace of God as by the love of her people; and long might she enjoy both these titles, notwithstanding the ill-advised measures of the noble lord. He (Mr. Grattan) was a member of the Irish Protestant Church, and he had also belonged to that body of Irish representatives who had supported the noble lord and followed him, until one day he sat down after dinner and wrote a letter to insult their constituents. In the noble lord's political adversity they had cheered him, but now he discarded them, tore their epaulettes from their shoulders, and drummed them out of his regiment. In the year 1813, Mr. Grattan brought in a bill, in the preparation and advocacy of which he was assisted by Mr. Canning, Mr. Wilberforce, Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Bushe, and other eminent men. He had the right to reproach the British Government and their predecessors for throwing out that bill, for it guarded against the danger which the noble lord apprehended. Mr. Canning introduced clauses which provided that a Roman Catholic bishop should make known his nomination to the commissioners proposed to be appointed under the bill, who were to report the same to his Majesty; and the bill also provided that any Papal bulls should be reported to the commissioners, so as to enable them to certify that the ecclesiastics appointed under them were loyal men. Why had the House of Commons rejected that bill? If it had been passed, the present altercations and heartburnings would have been avoided. In conclusion, he would say to the people of this country that they might be a great and powerful people, but a nation might be raised to a great height in order that her fall might supply a more impressive lesson to mankind. He would not occupy any more of their time in discussing the merits of a bill that was contemptible.

Mr. HENRY DRUMMOND rose to explain the sense in which he had used the two words adverted to by the hon. member. First, with regard to Dr. Cullen. He (Mr. Drummond) stated that after the Court of Rome received intelligence of Lord Clarendon's intentions with respect to the Queen's Colleges, and before the Pope took any step on the subject, Dr. Cullen was sent from Rome to "spy out" what was going on. Now, there was no harm in what the Pope did, or in what Dr. Cullen did, and the word therefore was not abused from its proper sense. The hon. member had mentioned another word that he (Mr. Drummond) had made use of, and he had only to say that he had not applied that epithet to any Roman Catholic bishop.

Mr. CONOLLY wished to treat this question with the respect due to the religious feelings of the Roman Catholics. This question has been discussed by most of the nations of Europe, and one and all had given the same response—namely, that the power of Rome must be restrained within certain limits, and that that power, unrestrained, was incompatible with free government and the independence of free States. But in England, which boasted, and rightly so, of more freedom than any other country in Europe, there were decidedly established all safe guarantees and stringent restrictions over the power of Rome. And had the freedom of the Roman Catholic Church suffered from that? He did not speak of the time of the penal laws, but of the time in which we live, and would any one stand up in that House and say there was not a free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in Great Britain? If he thought there was not that freedom he should be perfectly prepared to grant to his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen all indulgence for their spiritual wants; but, so far as regarded the assumption of temporal power by Rome, he contended we had a positive right, as Protestants and free Englishmen, to defend our guarantees against it, and were bound to uphold the liberties our ancestors had won for us.

Mr. P. WOOD would much rather have had the bill on the table of the House before he entered into this discussion; at the same time, principles had been advanced, more particularly on his own side of the House, so entirely at variance with those views that ought to lead to a right conclusion on this subject, that he felt it impossible to remain silent. He had with great surprise heard it asserted, first by his hon. and learned friend the member for Sheffield, and afterwards by the hon. member for Manchester, with whom he thought there was at least an accordance on one point of their political creeds, that the opinions expressed throughout the country in so plain and unequivocal a manner—in a manner more decided than anything he could recollect since the time of the Reform Bill, were to weigh for nothing; nay, more, that those who so expressed their opinions were chargeable with bigotry. He wished, as he had always wished, that the opinions of the large masses of the people of England should have yet more weight and effect than even they now had in that House. He had always wished, and still wished, that the suffrage should be extended, and the effect of that extension must be in a great measure, no doubt, to bring public opinion more strongly to bear upon questions that were discussed in that House; but he trusted he should be able to show there had been no feeling of bigotry in this matter whatsoever. It was true there had been great earnestness. He did not speak of individual displays of bigotry, but of the views and resolutions adopted and agreed to by large meetings of our fellow-countrymen. He did not speak of individual speeches, but of the resolutions passed, and he said those resolutions had in the main redounded to the honour, good sense, and judgment of our countrymen. They had almost one and all rejected all notion of a return to any penal law, and, whatever bigotry there was in individual speeches, no man was bold enough to propound any penal resolutions; and those public meetings had taken place in what he preferred—a perfectly constitutional mode; not meetings got up or assisted by agitation on the subject; but plain spontaneous meetings of the people in those places where by the constitution they were entitled to meet—he meant county meetings, or meetings of municipal corporations, vestries, and other bodies, in which they might constitutionally and legally express their opinions. Besides that, they had other bodies who were not generally actuated by rash and hasty motives—as the College of Physicians and other bodies; and he might also allude to a meeting of the members of his own profession, who were not accustomed to take a very active part in political matters, and who were not in the habit of attaching their signatures unadvisedly to any document. There was an address signed by seven hundred and seventy-six barristers residing in London; and, so far from its being called forth by the letter of the noble lord at the head of the Government, he knew that it had received the signatures of many, and among others his own, before that letter appeared. But, talking of the letter of the noble lord producing this mass of public feeling, he must say, with all respect for the noble lord, that he by no means produced the feeling called forth by this act of aggression, which the people regarded as an insult towards their Sovereign and an act of power long dormant in this country, but which they knew would resuscitate the old and antiquated feelings that our ancestors resisted before the Reformation, and which their successors were determined also to resist. But earnestness was not bigotry any more than indifference was not liberality. Bigotry consisted in a narrowness of mind which could not always perceive that the same truth was still the truth, under whatever aspect it presented itself. Again, it consisted of a narrowness of heart, a want of being able to sympathise with the errors of others, if even they were errors, and of imputing to others wrong motives; but there was an earnestness and devotedness of opinion which might well consist with the utmost liberality and enlarged conduct towards those who differed from us. He hoped he should not fall into the error of bigotry, and all he should say was, that he would abstain from saying one word or expressing one sentiment that could wound the religious feelings of those who heard him. As to the document which had proceeded from the bar, it had been signed on the ground that there had been an aggressive assumption of power which, on the part of a foreign potentate, was an insult to our Sovereign; that there had been a parcelling of this country into local districts and dioceses which it

was impossible to permit any foreign power to attempt. It was very easy for Cardinal Wiseman, and those who advised him and published pamphlets and other documents in his defence, to tell one thing to us, whilst there was another perfectly well understood by the whole of the Roman Catholic community to which they belonged. They were told there was nothing but a change of name, and that was echoed by his hon. and learned friend the member for Sheffield; and they said, "What is there in a name?" He was Vicar-Apostolic and Bishop of Melipotamus. Now he is only Archbishop of Westminster. He exercised the duties of cardinal, but that had nothing to do with this particular act; but the difference of his being Bishop of Melipotamus and Vicar-General, and of his being Bishop of Westminster, was just this—that as vicar-general he had no jurisdiction whatsoever—he had spiritual influence, he had spiritual power—the power of ordination and every other exercised *in foro conscientie*, but no power *in foro externo*. That distinction was perfectly well understood by all who knew anything on this subject. There might be a jurisdiction as regarded spiritual matters, totally distinct from a jurisdiction as regarded ecclesiastical matters. The spiritual power, as opposed to temporal power, was one thing; as ecclesiastical power opposed to spiritual power was another. Every bishop of a diocese exercised jurisdiction, not over 100, or 200, or 300 individuals in his diocese, but claimed, though he could not enforce it as the law stood, to exercise a jurisdiction distinct and direct—an ecclesiastical jurisdiction—over every inhabitant residing in his diocese. Dr. Wiseman perfectly understood that, and those who advised him understood it also. Now, by treaties with Turkey the Levant Company had entire plenary jurisdiction over all English residents in certain districts of Turkey, but did they suppose that the Sultan would allow any of our consuls-general to say they governed the districts of Beyrout and Lebanon? They governed the English subjects by treaty in those particular districts, but had no power or authority over the districts themselves. But if they were to say they were governors of Beyrout and Lebanon, the natural inference would be that they governed as pashas. The very term "diocese" was a well understood term; it was not new, they would find it in Cicero, he believed in one of his letters. Cicero spoke of the diocese of Cilicia, and the Roman Catholic Church had introduced that term, as it had many others of the Roman empire, into its vocabulary. It always meant a local district, including every inhabitant in it, and, in that respect, differed from a mere episcopacy exercising a vicarious jurisdiction as Bishop of Melipotamus. It had, also, always been accompanied by the appointment of a *sedes* or principal town in the diocese called the bishop's see. Then they were told there was no distinction between a bishop in Westminster and a Bishop of Westminster. But the late Bishop Coleridge, when he retired from his bishopric of Jamaica and lived amongst us, was a bishop in Westminster, but not Bishop of Westminster or London; and so it would be with any other bishop residing in, but not holding, any see in this country; a bishop of a diocese there could not be in this country except with the authority of the Crown. There could be no see, and Roman Catholic jurists agreed that the Pope could not erect any new see or diocese against the consent of the country in which it was to be established; and, more than that, some of the authorities said it could not be done without the consent of the Sovereign. If so, what consent had been obtained to this act? By the regulations lately made in France with respect to public newspapers, they had the names of the authors of the different articles, and in this case he found a recent article with the well-known name of "Goudon," which contained the following observations:—After quoting the Bishop of London's words, that the brief was a denial of the Queen's authority, of the English episcopacy, of the validity of our orders, and a claim of spiritual jurisdiction over our whole Christian population, M. Goudon continued:—"The brief of Pius IX. is, in fact, nothing less than that. The Bishop of London exactly appreciates its bearing. Just as St. Gregory transferred the primacy from London to Canterbury; as Popes Boniface and Honorius confirmed this change, so Pius IX. transfers to-day the primacy of Canterbury to the new archiepiscopal see of Westminster. It is by virtue of the authority bequeathed to him by his predecessors that the Pope substitutes for the see of London that of Southwark, and abolishes all the ancient sees erected in England by the Popes who have preceded him in the chair of St. Peter. Consequently, from the promulgation of the brief, there exists neither see of Canterbury nor of York, nor London, nor any of the sees established anterior to the Reformation. The personages who shall for the future assume the titles of Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London will be mere intruders, schismatic prelates, without any spiritual authority." He thought, if any person in Ireland not in a state of intoxication happened to enter the house of any of his hon. friends, and said—"I am master of the house and claim to possess it by virtue of title far anterior to yours," and suppose he produced some document anterior to Cromwell's time and entered the house, his honourable friend whose house was so entered would surely consider it an aggression. That being the state of things, let them see how we in England had always looked upon this matter. England, from the first, had acknowledged the right of the Sovereign in this particular. The Church of England had never attempted to create or erect a see otherwise than by Royal authority. An hon. friend said the Crown had no power to erect a see; but the Crown had the power to grant colonial sees, and why not sees in England? Simply for this reason—that they existed, and that they could not alter them. He was told that the See of Manchester was created; but in that case part

was taken from the See of Chester and part from that of York. The Crown had not the power of destroying sees—it could not destroy one tittle of Chester or one tittle of York—therefore an Act of Parliament was necessary to erect a new one out of them. But when there was no such see, as, for instance, the Cape of Good Hope, the Crown did erect a see of its own power. So did the Pope in his own jurisdiction. He (Mr. Wood) cared not how many sees the Pope created in Romagna—he knew the Pope could not erect another see in England. He had never been allowed to do anything of the kind in this country, and he never would. There could be no doubt that the assumption by any person within this realm of any portion of that power which alone appertained to the Crown, or the attempt to act under, or to bear any titles conferred by any such usurped jurisdiction, was an offence at common law. The man who merely held a court leet (the lowest jurisdiction that could be exercised) without authority was liable to an indictment. But the matter did not stop there. Cardinal Wiseman—he did not speak of the Pope, who had merely offended, though most grievously, against the law of nations—Cardinal Wiseman, and the others who had acted under the Pope's assumed authority, clearly intruded the 16th of Richard II., and as clearly the 13th of Elizabeth. To talk, as some gentlemen talked, of the House being about to legislate *ex post facto* in this matter, was to talk altogether without hook. The 24th section of the act of 1829, which some people regarded as repealing the statute of *premunire* and the act of Elizabeth at one swoop, had nothing whatever to do with either of those statutes. It was simply a section affixing a penalty upon the assumption of particular titles of particular existing sees. The statute of Richard II., which had reference to the much less offence, on the part of the Pope, of having attempted to translate bishops in England from one see to another, set forth the resolutions of the Commons and of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of England to assert the power of the King of England and his regality against any attempts at usurpation of the Pope of Rome, and declared guilty of *premunire* all persons in the kingdom who should in any way support or encourage any such attempts. There could be no question that the offence here committed fell precisely within that statute, and still more clearly, if possible, did it fall within the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth. To say, therefore, that because one of the sections of the Emancipation Act inflicted a particular penalty for a particular offence, the statutes of Richard and of Elizabeth were repealed, exhibited an entire confusion of ideas as to the objects of the several statutes, which were perfectly distinct. The object of the section in the Emancipation Act was to prevent the assumption by any person of the titles of already existent sees, an assumption obviously insulting to the actual holders; but the object in hand here was to consider, not how they were to deal with persons irregularly assuming titles which did not belong to them—in itself, no doubt, a thing to be deprecated—but the much graver and wider question, whether we were to allow any person to set up in this kingdom that power which once disturbed all Europe, and which, for anything we saw, might, amid the strange and inscrutable circumstances passing around us, once again be made the instrument of confusion and disturbance. Of all the monstrous misrepresentations—and there were many of them—put forward by Cardinal Wiseman, there was scarcely one more monstrous than the pretence that the case of the Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem was a parallel case with his own. With reference to this statement, he had carefully compared the patent of the Bishop of Jerusalem with the patent of the Bishop of Gibraltar. The former merely appointed the Bishop of Jerusalem, residing in a foreign country, to be a bishop of the United Church of England and Wales, having spiritual jurisdiction over such Protestant communities around him as thought fit to unite themselves with him; but it gave him no district or diocese, nothing more, in his way, than was given to the consuls of the Levant in theirs. When, however, he came to the patent of the Bishop of Gibraltar, he found that, applying to a portion of the Queen's own dominions, it gave to the Bishop of Gibraltar a diocese of Gibraltar, with the same authority and jurisdiction therein that a bishop of the Church in England enjoyed in his diocese. In the case of the Bishop of Jerusalem, then, the Queen of England had not broken the law of nations, as the Pope had been persuaded to do in the case of Cardinal Wiseman. The Pope, no doubt, had been misled throughout the whole business, and, probably, among others, by the same councillors who, in February, 1843, urged him to despatch a similar incendiary letter to that he had sent to England to the bishops throughout the East, redistributing their patriarchates, as he proposed to redistribute the episcopal sees of this country. He had read with great pleasure extracts from the encyclical letter, in which the four chief patriarchs of the East had repudiated with astonished indignation the insulting aggression of the Pope of Rome. It was contended that the present was no new claim on the part of the Popes; that the brief of Pius IX. had a recent precedent in the brief of Gregory XVI., with reference to the enlargement of vicarials, and that both the one and the other were mere matter of form, nothing more; the annihilation of the whole existing state of things in Protestant England was a mere matter of form, nothing more. But, on carefully going over the brief of Gregory XVI., he found that it was essentially different from the brief of Pius IX. The brief of Gregory XVI. spoke throughout, not of a Roman Catholic Church in England, but merely of the members of the Roman Catholic faith in England, and of the expediency of providing their increased numbers with increased vicarial superintendence; whereas the brief of Pius IX. set forth nothing less than this, that the Church of Rome, which had been extinguished for 300 years in Eng-

land, must be revived, and that he (the Pope) in the plenitude of his apostolic power, ordered and decreed that, throughout the kingdom of England, that Church should once more flourish by the medium of a hierarchy of bishops of her own. Since the Reformation no such attempt had been made in the realm of England by any Pope of Rome, even the most daring. It was said there was nothing aimed at in all this beyond the purely spiritual, that there was no notion of anything in the way of jurisdiction; and the hon. and learned member for Sheffield, with poetical figurativeness, had described the Popish missionaries as poor simple priests, who merely desired to operate upon the reason. Cardinal Wiseman, however, told a very different story; for in his manifesto he emphatically described the restored Church of Rome in England as revolving round the Pope as around the source of jurisdiction. The House of Commons was told not to revive obsolete statutes; the most pertinent instruction to Cardinal Wiseman and those who acted with him was not to revive obsolete claims. The Cardinal's reply upon the probability that the good taste of the Government would induce them not needlessly to recur to old statutes, had ostentatiously denied that the law was against him at all, and challenged the Government to prosecute him; but when some private person, taking the Cardinal at his word, said, "Oh, we'll prosecute you to your heart's content if you will only admit the necessary facts," the Cardinal thought twice of the matter. The Cardinal, had he brought the matter to the test of law, would have found there was needed no *ex post facto* legislation to bring the matter home to him. The present measure, in reality, so far from being an *ex post facto* measure, was nothing more than a declaratory act called for by the occasion. The distinction between Archbishop in Westminster and Archbishop of Westminster was no such trifling matter as the Cardinal desired to have it supposed. The Archbishop in Westminster was nobody; but the Archbishop of Westminster, once enforcing his authority, could collect his suffragans in synod, and effectively introduce those canon laws of which the very first involved the whole principle—*constitutiones principum, constitutionibus ecclesiasticorum, non preminent, sed obsequuntur*. Before he sat down he wished to make some remarks upon an attack which it had pained him to hear the hon. member for Manchester make upon the Established Church, which the honourable gentleman seemed to think the present a favourable moment for assailing. The honourable gentleman had paraded, with much ostentation, the names of several of his co-religionists, George Fox among them, who had undergone imprisonment for faith's sake. He would recall to the honourable member that there was a member of his society still more celebrated than George Fox—William Penn, who was basking in the favour of one of the most despotic monarchs that ever sat upon the throne of England, at the very time that seven bishops of the Protestant Church were confined in the Tower, vindicating their religion from the attempts of the monarch to overturn it. The Church of England was a portion of our history. The hon. member for Sheffield had reproached the noble lord at the head of the Government with manifest ignorance of history in bringing forward this measure. It appeared to him (Mr. Wood), on the contrary, that it was precisely because the noble lord had read history, and deeply, and learned thence what part had been taken by the Court of Rome in the transactions of England in past times, that he had now introduced this measure. The Church of England was no new thing. She existed as a Church two centuries and a half before a Roman priest ever sat his foot in England; and her bishops had taken their high parts in councils with no delegation from the Vatican. In his opinion, the great happiness and blessing and security of this country arose from the circumstance that its constitution was of historical growth; that it had advanced step by step, and that no man could put his finger upon any point of our annals and say, "Here it was the constitution of England sprang up." Our institutions had gradually grown and spread, from their living root, century after century. Among these institutions was the Church of England, of a growth, hour by hour, day by day, year by year. So that there was no point of its history at which you could say, "Here the Church became a new Church." Its reformation was the work of its own intrinsic vigour, of that vigour by which it had risen and flourished. He admitted that there was one short gap in our constitution, when despotism was established in our country under the name of a Protectorate, and at that same moment the Church establishment was swept away. He agreed with the noble lord entirely in deprecating—none could feel it more earnestly or seriously than himself—the spectacle of those who, holding preferments in the Church of England, had found it consistent with their duty, when their hearts were already weaned to Rome, when they had looked upon her, and had lusted after her, still to continue to officiate in our churches—he talked not of receiving the emolument, as a poor and wretched consideration—but who had continued to use the influence which they obtained by being placed in that position in order to pervert the hearts of the people. He was not speaking in the presence of Roman Catholic priests, but he was speaking in the presence of Roman Catholic gentlemen, and he felt most perfectly convinced that there was not one gentleman who heard him who must not be disgusted with the conduct of those individuals who, whilst performing the offices of one Church, were preparing to pass over to another. He knew the case of one unhappy man, who remained officiating in that Church, and who carried away with him the two children of the organist when he went to the Church of Rome; and he knew another instance in which a young man of 17 or 18 years of age, who, when at college, when his father was absolutely in a foreign clime, had been led away by one of those new bishops, who now affected to hold sees in this country, and he knew parties who had letters from that young man requesting them to keep it perfectly concealed from his mother and the whole of his family. Proceedings of this sort were most degrading, and had excited just indignation, and he

went so far with the noble lord; but when the noble lord told them that there were parties in the Church who were prepared to go "all lengths" in order, as the noble lord had termed it, to "purify the Church," he would say that while he would go all lengths to prevent such abominations as he had referred to, yet, on the other hand, they must be very careful how they judged the conduct of others. They knew that in all Churches there were parties who took different views, and that those who took a strong view with one party were apt to look upon those who at all differed from them as having just gone to the contrary extreme; while those who remained in the middle were supposed to belong to both. He rejoiced to say that that there were many now who held that high middle position, and who knew exactly the claims of a Catholic Church holding Catholic truth, and her claims as a Protestant Church, protesting against what she conceived to be the gross corruptions of the Church of Rome. He trusted that that same zeal which had hitherto been shown would continue to be manifested throughout England, directing itself to repel every aggression of this description, saying, "We will not allow our Sovereign's rights to be trampled on; we will not allow any foreign potentate to exercise control over us; we will not allow his bishops to act in synodical convention under his authority; and we will exert ourselves, not by violent agitation, but by the plain discharge of all our own duties in our several positions, by an earnest zeal in the erection of new churches and the appointment of additional clergymen, to preserve our Church in all the purity of the Reformation." He did not believe that the defection from our Church had been so great as it had been represented. He had carefully examined a Roman Catholic calendar, and he found that in a space of nine years they were able to state about 70 clergymen who had gone over. Now, 70 was no doubt a great number, but still 70 out of 15,000 was not so fearfully alarming that we should therefore despair of the Church, or should think of going to all lengths, or any length, in order to do that which might lead to that fatal thing—the disruption of that Church. He denied that anything he had said was of a retrogressive character. Why, their course was simply defensive; and when the hon. and learned member for Sheffield (Mr. Rocabuck) said that everything was so calm and so smooth until the noble lord's letter, he thought it strange that the hon. and learned gentleman should have forgotten the intervening letters of his Holiness the Pope. He (Mr. Wood) trusted that they should have no more of those letters, and for that reason he supported this measure. The hon. member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) had declared the measure to be paltry, mean, and useless, but he thought that the people of England would not be satisfied with the mere bare denial of the utility of the measure, without being provided with some standard to compare it with. For himself he believed, if the bill should contain a simple solemn recital of the position of the Sovereign with regard to these matters, and of the illegality of creating these sees without her consent, that it would do what was expected by the country, and what would be sufficient for the present emergency. It became them to embody in the great corporate voice of the nation the voices of those several meetings and assemblies which had resounded from one end of the kingdom to the other, requiring that a stop should be put to this insolent aggression—insolent he believed it to be, aggression unquestionably it was; and if they answered the people of England by putting that solemn protest upon record, and by preventing the Pope saying that there was the least assent to his procedure upon the part of the people of England, they should have vindicated their consistency as protesting against the corruptions of that Church on the one hand, and against his interference with our Government on the other; whilst, at the same time, they should free themselves from any charge of bigotry or intolerance, and should set an example in the face of the world which was worthy of a great nation. One word with reference to America. It should be remembered that we had historical recollections, America had not; that we had a constitutional history, she had not; and that the whole thread and tenor of our constitution was, that no power on earth had jurisdiction, temporal or ecclesiastical, in these realms other than the Queen of England.

Mr. M'CULLAGH confessed, while he had listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. and learned gentleman who had just sat down, that he had been unable to detect in the greater portion of it any logical attempt to reason in favour of the first reading of this bill. The hon. and learned the Attorney-General had talked of this affair of Cardinal Wiseman's as an "offence;" but if it were an offence, it must have been explicitly either against the Crown or against some portion of the subjects of the Crown, and if against the Crown it was clearly the duty of the law officers, without seeking a miserable admission, to have instituted proceedings, no matter what the issue, and to have vindicated the insulted rights of the Crown. He did not think, however, that they had erred in judgment in abstaining from a prosecution, for such a prosecution would have been a disgrace to the age; but then it was too bad to go down to that House when the passions of the dominant creed in that empire had been lashed to fury, and to prejudice the question whether an offence had been committed or not by using the phrase "offence" deliberately over and over again. It was an unusual course to divide the House upon the introduction of a measure by the First Minister; but this was an unusual occasion, and it was one which suggested their duty to them, and reminded them of their privileges. Their objection to the motion was mainly this, and upon it the question must eventually turn: Were they justified, as a Parliament not exclusively Protestant, not exclusively Anglican, not exclusively of any denomination, in setting open again the gates of sectarian legislation and the policy of ascendancy? He had listened with great attention to the speech of the Prime Minister, and the conclusion he had come to was, that the noble lord had made out no case for the intervention by Parliament in the internal discipline of the Catholic

Church; and he maintained that to ignore the hierarchy of that Church was virtually to ignore, and to attempt to suppress and overthrow, the discipline and order of that Church. He had heard with astonishment the intellectual intrepidity with which the hon. and learned member for Oxford had appealed to an argument which might be stated thus:—"You are only asked to do that which your Catholic ancestors did before you." Why, there never was a case since history was written less in point for the purpose. Our Catholic ancestors had to deal with by far the greatest political power in the middle ages, and yet the very men who quoted the instance of our Catholic ancestors told them in the same breath that the Catholic laity were such slaves, that it was necessary to shield them by an Act of Parliament against the overweening tyranny of their clergymen. It was said that the statute of Elizabeth, which had been unrepealed by Lord Lyndhurst's Act, furnished another precedent which they should follow. But Elizabeth came to the throne at a time when her right was held to be invalid by the Kings of France and Spain, when her crown was in jeopardy, when her rival was upon the throne of Scotland, and when a great portion of her subjects were half inclined to return to the Queen of Scots, and to throw off their allegiance to Elizabeth. Though her measures, therefore, were severe and unjustifiable, the necessity was one of the greatest emergency. The precedent of the Stuarts also was equally beside the case. So with respect to the code of penal laws which Parliament was asked to imitate. When they were enacted there was a Pretender, a formidable rival of the existing dynasty. Was there a Pretender now? There was no pretext for saying that the State, as a State, that the crown of the Queen, that the authority or permanence of the law, were jeopardised. The hon. and learned member for Oxford hardly adverted to the extension of the measure now proposed to the sister kingdom. The noble lord who introduced it had, however, brought a bill of accusation against the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. A more unjust statement could not well be made than that of the First Minister of the Crown. His accusation against the Catholic Primate was, that Dr. Cullen was not appointed in the usual way, but, being a man unacquainted with the circumstances of the country, a stranger to the state of Ireland, a resident at Rome, was chosen for another purpose than to promote its religious good, and without justification from his personal qualifications. By birth, education, and frequent intercourse, Dr. Cullen was a person who must necessarily be acquainted with the state of Ireland, ecclesiastical and civil. He was constantly informed of every fact relative to the Church of Ireland. With respect to the election of Dr. Cullen, which the noble lord described as contrary to the usual mode, the explanation was, that on the death of the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, the priests of the archdiocese proceeded to elect in the ordinary way, but the bishops differed in their judgment from the priests. Two recommendations were forwarded to Rome, when the wise course was taken of selecting another person. The noble lord said the first act of Dr. Cullen was one which led him to consider whether a prosecution should not be instituted against that prelate. It seemed incomprehensible that any question whether Dr. Cullen could be prosecuted for calling himself Primate of Ireland should have occurred to the law-officers of the Crown, with the table of precedence announced in the *Gazette* on the occasion of her Majesty's visit lying before them. The noble lord, in a very significant tone, assured the House that Dr. Cullen had assumed secular jurisdiction by addressing the Irish people on the questions of landlord and tenant, and of the Queen's Colleges. As a Protestant, he (Mr. M'Cullagh) did not identify himself with the sentiments of that document. But if archbishops and bishops were not warranted in giving an opinion on the education of the people, he could not see to what subjects they were justified in referring. In the whole twenty-six closely-printed pages of the synodical address, there were just sixteen lines which had reference to questions of the occupation of land. Even that passage had not very distinct reference to the occupation of land; it alluded to a lamentable state of facts which they described as existing, not throughout the kingdom, but in a particular portion of the island, owing to ruthless, unscrupulous, wholesale evictions. Sir Robert Peel described the state of matters in Ireland as more terrible in 1848 than if the country had been invaded by a foreign army. There was a time when England was depopulated ruthlessly and cruelly, and Latimer spoke of the landlords as "rent-raisers," "step-lords;" of "the portentous dearth made by man," of places where once there were many householders living inhabited but "by a shepherd and a dog." It was said every act done by Dr. Cullen, as diocesan, was null. What did that mean in a Catholic country? Was that the realisation of the dream in which Pitt had indulged? No man had gone further than the noble lord in contending for equality in respect of religion. Was this his equality? The noble lord foresaw a struggle on which he was prepared to enter. This act of anti-Catholic policy, then, was but the first rattle in the scabbard of persecution. Much was said of toleration—an insolent, temporising word, which signified intolerance in another form; but he felt assured that every step now taken in a retrograde direction would have ere long to be retraced; and the attempt to counteract the effects of the present policy might be penitently made, but it might be made when too late.

Sir G. GREY, after the ample discussion which this question had undergone, should hardly have felt it necessary, on a motion for leave to lay on the table of the House the bill that had been proposed by the Government, to offer himself to the attention of the House, were it not for some observations that had been made in the course of the debate which he felt it his duty not altogether to pass over. It was impossible, without reference to the specific motion before the House, not to feel the inconvenience of a protracted discussion upon the minute details of a bill which was, no doubt, prepared and ready to be laid before them, but which was not yet

on their table, and therefore not before the House. He did not, however, lament the discussion which had taken place, because he thought the ground had been very much cleared for future debate by the demonstration of certain propositions which he ventured to think had been established by the most conclusive argument and convincing evidence. Some of these propositions he would very briefly advert to. It had been demonstrated, for example, that in this matter they were acting clearly on the defensive, that the step they were taking in accordance with demands made from one end of Great Britain to the other was a step purely defensive, and one that had been provoked entirely by those whom they had thus been compelled reluctantly to oppose. The hon. member for Dublin, followed by the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, complained of the bigotry of the English people; and the hon. member for Dublin drew a pleasing picture of the cordiality existing between persons of different creeds down to a late period. He stated truly that the Roman Catholics and the Protestants had been living in the interchange of acts of brotherly kindness one with another; and then he said we had disturbed this friendly feeling, and that a war of religious rancour and discord had been raised, which we had gratuitously provoked. That position, however, he entirely denied. Another point which had been established was, that the act of which complaint was made, not by the Government, but the nation, was an illegal act. The illegality had been demonstrated, but he need only refer to the speech of the hon. and learned member for Oxford, as showing that it was contrary both to the international law of Europe and the statute-law of this realm. That was attempted to be controverted by the hon. gentleman who had last spoken, not, however, by argument, but by pure assertion. He omitted all reference to the arguments of the hon. and learned member for Oxford with regard to the law of nations; and on the subject of the statute-law he alluded to the well-known connexion of Lord Lyndhurst with the bill for repealing the statute of Elizabeth. But he omitted to notice that Lord Lyndhurst inserted in that bill an amendment declaring that nothing contained in that repeal should render lawful the act of which complaint was now made. The honourable gentleman said it was the duty of the Government to prosecute in this case if they thought an offence had been committed; but he would tell the hon. gentleman that there were many acts committed against the statute law in this realm that Government did not see its duty, in the exercise of the discretion reposed in it, to prosecute. If they were condemned for not instituting a prosecution against Dr. Wiseman, he was prepared to defend their conduct on that ground whenever it was seriously impugned. But in the meantime he would go on to say that another point which had been established and demonstrated without contradiction, at least by argument, was, that the act of which they complained was not the spiritual act of a merely spiritual authority, for the benefit of the members of a communion of which that authority was the head, but that it was the act of an ecclesiastical authority committed by a power of mixed temporal and ecclesiastical authority, and an act that claimed undivided sway and dominion over the whole realm of England. Time would not allow him to read the terms of the brief in which the act was embodied, or the best argument that he could use to show its true nature would be merely to read the language of that document, language that discarded altogether the authority of the Queen in the realm of England, language that ignored altogether not the rights only but the very existence of any other Church or religious denomination, whether established or not in this realm, but that presided over by the Pope of Rome, and those acting under his authority. The very language, he repeated, of the brief, combined with that used in the pastoral which had been issued, was sufficient demonstration that it was not a spiritual act confined to that communion, but one which embraced matters ecclesiastical as well as spiritual, and put forward claims inconsistent with the supremacy of the Queen and the rights and privileges of all the inhabitants of this country, whether Roman Catholics, members of the Church of England, or Dissenters. These points had been satisfactorily established in the course of the debate, and it now only remained for the House to determine whether the bill was or was not adequate to the occasion. There had been various observations made tending to cast censure upon his noble friend the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland with regard to the course he had adopted. He was said to have encouraged this act of aggression on the part of the Pope. A similar charge had been made against other members of the Government; but all these charges he was prepared to meet, and deny. The charges made against the Government might be resolved into three heads. The first was the recognition of a Roman Catholic hierarchy, by giving titles of honour and respect to heads of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The second was a charge distinctly made by the hon. member for Sheffield, that the Government had habitually addressed Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland by titles not permitted by law. Then members of the Government were accused—and one in particular had been charged again, notwithstanding his positive denial in another place—with having had a knowledge of the intentions of the Pope of Rome, and that to the propositions contained in the letter apostolical consent was given either expressed or tacit. Now, with respect to such titles as “his grace” to an archbishop, or “my lord” to a bishop, he wished to say that he was not going to offer any excuse or apology for treating with marked honour and respect in a country where the great bulk of the people were Roman Catholics, the heads of that community in that country, so long as those individuals conformed with the law under the protection of which they lived. But what were the facts of the case? These charges had been made by various individuals; but he would take first that which had been brought forward by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, because he had made his allegation in a more distinct form than others, in a letter which he had addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant of Buckinghamshire. The hon. member for Buckinghamshire had been very severe upon his noble friend for the letter he had written, but forgot that he himself

had been guilty also of the indiscretion which he seemed to think chargeable upon any person who wrote and published a letter. He would not call that letter a "blunder of a sudden," but he must say that he never saw, from beginning to end, a letter containing a greater collection of blunders than that which had been published by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire. He could not sufficiently express his surprise that the hon. gentleman, knowing, as he might have done, that all the charges he had made were incorrect, should have ventured on an epistolary correspondence of this kind. In his letter he stated, that "when the present Lord-Lieutenant arrived in his viceroyalty he gathered together the Romish bishops of Ireland, addressed them as nobles, sought their counsel, and courted their favour." That statement was cheered by an hon. gentleman opposite, but he was sure the explanation he had now to give would be satisfactory to the House. Shortly after the arrival of Lord Clarendon in Ireland, when the state of that country was one that seriously occupied the attention of the Government in consequence of the famine with which Providence had visited the land, he did gather around him, not a court, as was represented, but a deputation of five of the prelates of the Catholic Church, to hear from them a representation of the state of the country, and to hear them suggest the remedial measures which they had to propose. They were, of course, received by the Lord-Lieutenant with that respect that their position entitled them to, and he listened attentively to the suggestions which they had to offer. He asked for their counsel, and said he should be happy to hear and consider any practical measures of relief which they had to propose, his object being to save life in Ireland, and to avert the calamity under which the people suffered. The hon. gentleman went on to say, "that on the visit of her Majesty to that kingdom the prelates were presented to the Queen as if they were nobles, and precedence was given them over the nobility and dignitaries of the national Church." Now, he begged leave to tell the hon. gentleman, that on that occasion the Roman Catholic prelates that were presented to her Majesty, and presented an address and received an answer from her Majesty, did not take precedence of any dignitary of the Protestant Church in Ireland. They took place in exactly the same position in which they had been received and presented on the occasion of the visit of George IV. to Ireland. He defied the hon. gentleman to justify the assertion that the Lord-Lieutenant or the Government had in regard of the titles of Roman Catholic bishops acted contrary to the law. In every respect they had acted in conformity with the provisions of the act of George IV., which prevented the holding titles enjoyed by prelates of the Established Church. As to the *entrée* to the Castle on the occasion of her Majesty's visit, that was a matter which hardly devolved on the Government. Technically, the person who was responsible for the ordinances issued on that occasion was the Lord Chamberlain, a member of the Free Kirk of Scotland, and not likely to encourage any conspiracy having for its end the exaltation of the Roman Catholic bishops. With respect to the private *entrée* list published in the *Gazette*, neither Lord Clarendon nor himself was responsible for that publication. On this point he would read the following letter from Mr. Willis, a gentleman of the Lord Chamberlain's office, which would place the matter in its true light:—

"My Lord,—In reply to your Excellency's inquiry relative to the private *entrée* list published in the *Dublin Gazette* of the 7th of August, 1849, wherein 'The Most Rev. Dr. Murray' is described as 'Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin,' I have to state, that I submitted for approval a list of the private *entrée*, and from recollection, and to the best of my belief, in order to designate more fully the Most Rev. Dr. Crolly and the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, their names were written by me in that list as 'Roman Catholic Primate,' and 'Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.'

"In transcribing this list for the *Gazette*, owing to the extreme pressure of business, there having been in three days nearly 5,000 persons signifying their intention of coming to Court, and requiring immediate attention, I must have inadvertently, and contrary to custom, copied the names of the Roman Catholic prelates as designated in the submitted list and published in the *Gazette*."

Lord Clarendon knew nothing of that entry in the *Gazette*. He (Sir G. Grey) had the honour of attending her Majesty; he knew nothing of it. Let the House understand the matter. The *entrée* was not given upon that occasion, the *entrée* had been given for years before. The Roman Catholic archbishop exercising jurisdiction in the diocese of Armagh, the Roman Catholic archbishop exercising jurisdiction in the diocese of Dublin, were habitually admitted at the *entrée*. The designation, no doubt, was an incorrect and improper one; and, if any responsibility for that error, only then committed, rested upon him (Sir G. Grey), having been in attendance upon her Majesty, he was willing to bear any censure the House might cast upon him. But was this miserable fact the only shred of evidence by which the assertion could be made out, that it had been the habitual practice of the Irish Government to violate the law, and to designate the Roman Catholic prelates by titles to which they had no right? The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House went further; he improved upon the statement, and said that those prelates were received by her Majesty by those titles. The hon. gentleman did not say whether, being an Irish member, he was there, or whether he spoke from information. He said that he (Sir G. Grey) had the honour—which was true—of being near her Majesty—the honour and the privilege he had of witnessing the impartial grace and condescension with which she received all classes of her subjects, without any regard to differences of opinion or creeds. He saw also the universal loyalty which pervaded all classes of her subjects, and he saw with satisfaction the venerable prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in that country addressing her Majesty, not (as the hon. member said) by titles prohibited by law, not received by her Majesty by such titles, but assuming titles in strict conformity with

the law designating themselves: "We, the undersigned bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland." But the hon. gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) was not satisfied with two errors; in his eagerness to condemn the Government, he said—"It was only the other day, as I believe, that the Government offered the office of visitor to the Queen's Colleges to Dr. Cullen, the Pope's delegate, and *pseudo* Archbishop of Armagh, and to Dr. M'Hale, the *pseudo* Archbishop of Tuam." That charge had not been repeated now, but it had been made in most distinct terms, as if in justification of the act of the Pope, in Mr. Bowyer's pamphlet, "by authority," charging it upon the Government that they encouraged the act. If he meant that the office of visitor was offered to those two prelates, he was quite right; and here again he (Sir G. Grey) would condescend to no apology. In offering the office of visitor to those two prelates, Lord Clarendon only acted in the spirit of the Government and of Parliament in bringing forward and passing the measure for establishing those colleges. But if it was meant that, as Mr. Bowyer stated, the offer was made to them, or the appointments were bestowed, in the style of "Archbishop of Armagh," and "Archbishop of Tuam," that was what was decidedly contrary to the fact, and what the slightest reference to official documents would have shown to be so. The statement had been made recklessly, presuming upon its accuracy, but with whomsoever it originated, it was entirely destitute of any shadow of truth. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) went on—there was not a paragraph in his letter which did not contain some blunder—"The fact is, that the whole question has been surrendered, and decided in favour of the Pope by the present Government; and the Ministers, who recognised the *pseudo* Archbishop of Tuam as a peer and a prelate, cannot object to the appointment of a *pseudo* Archbishop of Westminster, even though he be a Cardinal. On the contrary, the loftier dignity should, according to their table of precedence, rather invest his Eminence with a still higher patent of nobility, and permit him to take the wall of his Grace of Canterbury and the highest nobles of the land." Now really this charge of recognition of the archbishop as a "peer," one could hardly have conceived possible to originate with a gentleman so well informed as the hon. member for Buckinghamshire. He had adopted the vulgar notion that if you called a man a lord you made him a peer. Lord Clarendon was charged with invading the Queen's prerogative by calling the archbishops by their titles. But here again he was wrong, not only in matter of fact, but in matter of history, because those titles were conferred long before Lord Clarendon had anything to do with the government of Ireland. It was not true that the Bequests Act, or the Order in Council, conferred any such titles; but in the reports of the meetings of the Commissioners under the act, before Lord Clarendon had anything to do with Ireland or the present Government was in office, it appeared that on the 9th of January, 1845, among the commissioners who attended there were described "His Grace the Lord Archbishop William Crolly," and "His Grace the Lord Archbishop Daniel Murray;" and it was right to confer such titles of honour upon them while they conformed to the law, and trenching upon no privilege of the Established Church. But if there was blame, let it not rest entirely upon the present Lord-Lieutenant or Government, who acted in the same spirit of conciliation as the preceding, though both of them, perhaps, in some degree with too little suspicion and in too confiding a spirit; let it not be said towards the great body of their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, for they must be acquitted of any such feeling; but there were some, it seemed, who now had built upon this a fabrication of acquiescence on the part of the Government in a measure which no member of the Government had any reason to suppose would emanate from the Court of Rome. With regard to the title of cardinal, the hon. gentleman thought it one which ought to justify precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury; but it was not necessarily an ecclesiastical title—it might be conferred on a layman. But no such title conferred by the Pope or any foreign Sovereign could be assumed by a British subject without the license of the Crown; Dr. Wiseman had not applied to the Crown for that license, and without that license he could enjoy no shadow of right to precedence here. With regard to the Archbishop of Tuam, a mistake had been made as to the alleged reception of a petition to Parliament by him, and an inference had been drawn by Lord St. Germans not warranted by the facts. He said that the House consented to receive the petition on the ground that it was not contrary to law. The fact was, that upon a debate, a large majority, including the noble lord (Lord John Russell), refused to receive that petition; it was held that it was an infraction of the law, and that Dr. M'Hale had no right to that title. Notice had been taken during the debate of a confidential communication of Lord Clarendon with the Pope. Now, upon that subject he (Sir G. Grey) had a letter from Lord Clarendon which, if the House desired, he could read to them, though he really thought it unnecessary. With regard to one part of the charge, namely, that the letter was addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin, it was only necessary to say that the words "His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin" affixed to that letter, were a complete fabrication. Lord Clarendon stated:—

" . . . In the autumn of 1847, the Board of Presidents sitting in Dublin were occupied in framing the statutes for the colleges. I was in constant communication with them, and I also sought the advice of different persons whose knowledge and experience might aid in rendering the statutes complete, and thereby fulfilling the intentions of the Government which had founded the colleges and the Legislature which had sanctioned them. I was also most anxious to remove the charge of 'godlessness' which had been brought against the colleges in England, and eagerly adopted by the enemies of those

institutions in Ireland; and I moreover thought it a solemn obligation that the moral training and religious instruction of the students frequenting the colleges should be guarded with the most scrupulous care. I accordingly consulted several clergymen of different denominations, and, among others, Dr. Nicholson, the Coadjutor-Archbishop of Corfu, who had just arrived in Ireland, and, having passed some time at Rome on his way, was cognisant of all the unfounded rumours current there respecting the colleges which had led to the condemnation of them by the Pope; and as he was shortly about to return to Rome, I was glad of the opportunity to show him how the interests of religion and morality were guaranteed for all denominations alike (by the appointment of deans of residence and the establishment of licensed boarding-houses, &c.), and consequently the utter falsehood of the report that the colleges had been established for the purpose of undermining the Roman Catholic religion. . . . When the statutes were completed and agreed to, Dr. Nicholson was about to return to Corfu by the way of Rome, and I willingly gave him an extract from them which related to moral discipline and religious instruction, in the belief that it was the best mode of communicating the truth to the Pope, and of confuting the unjustifiable misrepresentations made to him; and I have no hesitation in saying that I was desirous to effect this, because the condemnation of the colleges by the Pope was likely to deprive many of the Roman Catholic youth of Ireland of the advantages offered to them by the Legislature. I wished, therefore, that he should know and consider the precautions taken, in order that he might become aware of the errors upon which his condemnation had been founded. If I had been capable of seeking any foreign sanction to a matter of domestic arrangement, I should have employed different means for the purpose, and have referred the statutes to the Pope while they were being framed; but in March, 1848, they were completed, and copies of the same 'extract' that was given to Dr. Nicholson were likewise placed in the hands of several spiritual authorities of the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Presbyterian denominations. . . . Previously to the departure of Dr. Nicholson, I consented, at his request, to write him a private letter, which should serve, if necessary, as a guarantee that the 'extract' he took with him was genuine; and that when the list of visitors was framed Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of the same rank as Protestants should be selected. I have been blamed for the terms in which I expressed myself with respect to the character and judgment of the Pope; but I sincerely thought what I then said, and similar opinions were then entertained of him not only in England but throughout Europe; for, at the beginning of 1848, he was universally regarded as an enlightened reformer, who, with great boldness and in the face of many foreign and domestic difficulties, was determined to act upon his own conviction of what was just and right. And with respect to the care taken to preserve the faith and morals of Roman Catholic students, I said nothing in my letter to Dr. Nicholson which, *mutatis mutandis*, I did not also say to the spiritual authorities of different denominations in Ireland, to whom it was quite satisfactory. . . ."

This letter got into other hands without the knowledge and sanction of Lord Clarendon, and the alteration made in the superscription of the letter was not made by Dr. Nicholson. The other charge distinctly repeated by the hon. member for Sheffield, notwithstanding the denial given elsewhere—the charge against Lord Minto in regard to a direct communication from the Pope to him of intention to promulgate this document, was founded now upon a letter received from Abbé Hamilton, an English gentleman, who had become a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and who stated, as he (Sir G. Grey) understood, that he met Lord Minto in the ante-chamber, or coming out from the reception from the Pope, and that Lord Minto volunteered this statement: "The Pope has given me a full account of his intended establishment of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England, and I have told him it is a matter that concerns exclusively the Roman Catholic Church, and that it is nothing to the English Government." He (Sir G. Grey) was not aware of any such statement, but he was rather surprised that a letter of that kind should have been seen by the hon. member for Sheffield, because a correspondence had taken place between the Abbé Hamilton and Lord Minto. The Abbé Hamilton wrote to Lord Minto, after information had reached Rome of the feeling excited in this country by the publication of the Pope's brief, endeavouring to call his recollection to a conversation between himself and Lord Minto at his hotel in Rome—not of the description given by the hon. member for Sheffield, but in which he (the Abbé) said he entreated Lord Minto to use his influence at Rome to forward the execution of this scheme, of which the Abbé presumed Lord Minto had been informed. In answer to that letter, Lord Minto wrote to the Abbé to say that he had no recollection of the alleged conversation, and that, although he was not unaware of some intention of conferring archiepiscopal rank on Dr. Wiseman, already a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, he had, neither during his residence at Rome, nor at any subsequent period, down to the publication of the bull, the slightest suspicion of any design for the organization of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England, and that the publication of the Pope's bull took no one more completely by surprise than himself. To this letter again the Abbé Hamilton replied that he now saw the mistake which he had made, and of which Lord Minto's letter afforded the explanation. After the distinct denial given by Lord Minto in the other House of Parliament, and after the statement which the hon. member for Sheffield had subsequently made in the House of Commons, he (Sir G. Grey) wished, at all events, to state what were the real facts which had occurred. A great deal had been said by several hon. members as to

what had fallen from the First Lord of the Treasury, not in the least anticipating that the Court of Rome, considering the friendly terms on which it professed to exist towards this country, would have taken advantage of any language held or any act done by him several years ago. But those hon. members overlooked the fact that with reference to this subject a question was asked his noble friend by the hon. baronet the member for the University of Oxford as to some proposition having been made by the Pope of Rome with respect to the creation of Roman Catholic archbishops in England, and that his noble friend replied that no proposition of the kind had been made to him; and that if any such measure had been taken, or should be taken by the Pope, it would not receive the sanction of the Government. That was certainly a sufficient notice to the Court of Rome that any such measure would not be acceptable to the Government of this country. Therefore, if in the face of this express, clear, and honest declaration, the Court of Rome created any such titles, it was undeniable that, in so acting, it was done against the avowed and well-known wishes of the Government of this country. Having thus described the real nature of the question as put to his noble friend in 1848, he must say that there was no pretence afforded by the answer of his noble friend for the allegations which had been made by the hon. member for Sheffield and others as to the purport of what fell from his noble friend on that occasion. He would now say a few words in reply to the charge which had been made as to the inadequacy of the present bill. The bill was founded upon the principle of not interfering in the slightest degree with the freest exercise of the Roman Catholic religion; it was founded in perfect good faith with regard to those statutes which guaranteed the exercise of that religion without molestation in this country. But while the bill did this it was at the same time quite adequate to the occasion. It met every act of the Pope, and placed an effectual check upon what gave just offence to, and which was complained of, by the people of England. While the Pope presumed to constitute an Archbishop of Westminster, and a certain number of suffragan bishops, who were to derive their titles either from the ancient sees of this realm, or from the cities and towns of this portion of the United Kingdom, this bill said that there should be no such Archbishop of Westminster and no such bishops, whom the Pope would attempt to constitute, unless they were constituted by law—that they should be created by the law, and not by the Pope of Rome; that no bishops in this country should be made by the decree of the Pope, but by the Lords and Commons of the United Kingdom. While the Pope proceeded to confer on the bishops the widest sovereignty over the people of this country, and gave to them the most extended jurisdiction, the bill of his noble friend said that every act of that kind should be null and void; that every act attempted to be exercised under the decree of the Pope should be null and void; and while the Pope invited wealthy Catholics to contribute to the endowment of those sees, the bill said, that if those sees were endowed by property being vested in persons bearing titles of the description thereby prohibited, those endowments should enure to the Crown. It was true that the bill did not go the length which the hon. member for Buckinghamshire thought it desirable that it should go—namely, that it should settle at once and for all the relation between the Roman Catholic subjects of England and the Pope. It might be very desirable that such a settlement should take place; but he (Sir G. Grey) would caution his hon. friends who were desirous of seeing that object attained, not to reject a practical measure for the purpose of introducing one which this was neither the fitting time nor the most suitable opportunity for attempting to accomplish. He would caution his hon. friends against running away with the notion that it was easy to effect their object before having an opportunity of knowing how it was to be accomplished. There were two ways by which they might proceed. One was the re-enactment of the penal laws; but that was a course which not only Parliament but the country would repudiate: the other was one which would require that they should take into consideration the whole ecclesiastical arrangements of the country, and, bearing in mind the condition of Ireland, he would ask whether they were disposed to embark in such an undertaking? He threw these remarks out only as the means of gathering information in the absence of any suggestion from the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, and he would ask his hon. friends not to throw away the substance now offered to them for the shadow which was held out to them by that hon. member. But, after all, an Act of Parliament was not the only or the best security for the Protestant religion, or faith of this country. He should deeply regret if he felt any serious alarm with regard to those principles which were justly dear to the people of this country. He knew of no reason to believe that, if this bill passed, the loyalty of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects would not lead them implicitly to obey it. Still, the history of past times told them that by ingenuity and subtlety the object of the Legislature might be defeated. But his real feeling of security for the Protestant religion of this country, and his reliance for its safety against any successful encroachment or aggression on the part of the Church of Rome was the noble display of Protestant feeling which, during the last three months, had been exhibited from one end of Great Britain to the other. This was the best security they could possess against the encroaching power and ambitious attempts of the Pope, who from this great national demonstration might learn what was the true characteristic of the British people. It was a display which showed how deeply were the minds of men of all denominations—whether connected or not with the Church—imbued with the true Protestant feeling, spontaneously bursting forth, as that feeling had done at the very first attempt made since the Reformation to impose the yoke of Catholic power, from which the wisdom and enlightenment of their ancestors had succeeded in rescuing this country. The people had, as with one voice, declared that they were not prepared to establish this new hierarchy in

England, and to return to the Roman Catholic Church. This feeling he believed to be founded on their appreciation of those blessings which from the time of the Reformation they had enjoyed. He thought that the language in which this national demonstration had been expressed, and the arguments which had been uttered, would not fail to reach the recesses of the Vatican, and would succeed in dispelling the fond imagination that the people of this country were ready to submit again to the Pope of Rome, and turn to that Church which claimed universal domination over the whole of Christendom. Whatever might be the effect of the present measure passing into a law, of this he was convinced, that the people of this country were determined more than ever to hold fast by those principles which they had derived from the Reformation, and which had been fraught with so many blessings to them—blessings of which they of the present generation were the responsible depositories, and which, by God's help, they would transmit unimpaired to their posterity.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEBRUARY 12.

Mr. P. H. HOWARD expressed his desire to address the House, because he would not appear to shrink in the hour of peril from the defence of his faith, which was now bound up with the great cause of religious liberty. A retrograde step on the part of a nation or Legislature always led to harsher measures; and the spirit of persecution, like other passions, was only strengthened by gratification. He hoped to defend his creed with what Whitbread had called "intrepid moderation;" violence and insult had been described by a French philosopher as a sign of error. No one knew better than the right hon. member for Northumberland (Sir G. Grey), who had spoken of the unanimity of the movement against the so-called Papal aggression, that the effort to get up an anti-Catholic demonstration in that county had utterly failed; and his knowledge of the north of England must have informed him that in the county of Durham there had been no county meeting, in the proper sense. None had been held in the wealthy county of Lancaster. What had been the case in some of the largest towns in the empire? Had not Leeds petitioned the House to guard religious freedom? Birmingham had refused to address her Majesty; and in Carlisle, the town he (Mr. P. H. Howard) represented, the town-council had not felt it their duty to thank the Prime Minister for addressing a letter in November to the Bishop of Durham. The Prime Minister, who had made strong charges against the Catholic religion, eulogised the Church of England as a very tolerant Church. Praise ill-bestowed might degenerate into satire. What did twenty-six bishops of the Establishment designate the creed from which they affected to derive their own orders—as the inculcator of "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?" There were relatives of the Sovereign who belonged to the Church so denounced—Ferdinand of Coburg, Prince of Portugal, and the Princess Victoria of Coburg, Duchess de Nemours. The late Queen of the Belgians was connected by marriage with the Queen. The Bishop of Oxford said, "Who needs to be told that Romanism is a system that so saps honesty in men's minds that there is nothing dishonest that may not be deemed holy, and nothing that becomes subject to its control that is not defiled by its pollution." Were these words which the Prime Minister thought tolerant? If they were so, what was intolerance? These were words, uttered not in the heat of debate, but calmly in Merton College, when their author was teaching in the University with which the names of Wykelam and Chichele were associated. Then the Bishop of Durham proposed the suppression of all monastic orders in England or Scotland—a measure of most positive persecution. In the long oration with which the First Minister of the Crown had prefaced the introduction of this measure his words upon the direct question were very few. He did not prove that the law had in any respect been violated, and, if the law was not violated, where was the aggression? The law was not a matter of sentiment or poetry, it was a course of action and of conduct, resting on precise definitions and enactments. If the noble lord considered the law to have been violated, why did he not prosecute those who had committed that violation? But seeing that the law officers of the Crown had been unable to institute any such prosecution he (Mr. Howard) came to the conclusion that no aggression had taken place. But though the noble lord was silent upon the question of aggression, he went very far to seek for precedents. He arraigned the policy of a distant potentate, the Emperor of Austria, who had lately ascended the steps of that time-honoured throne, which, in the graphic language of Napoleon, never died. The predecessor of that monarch, the Emperor Joseph, lost the brightest gem of the Imperial Crown, the Austrian Netherlands, by his interference with the religious principles of his subjects, and he believed the present sovereign had acted wisely in the steps he had recently adopted with reference to the Church. The noble lord referred to the synod of Thurles, as an instance of ecclesiastical interference with the principles of religious liberty; but was it a singular circumstance to see religious instructors taking part in educational disputes? When the right hon. gentleman (Sir J. Graham) introduced a measure connected with education, was it not defeated by the combined opposition of the Wesleyans and other religious bodies? Then, as regarded the national system of education in Ireland, had it not been opposed by the great majority of the clergymen of the Established Church in that country? He did not mention these cases in the way of blame, but to show that on all questions of education the spiritual guides of the people felt it their duty to take a part; and he might say that it was a duty intimately associated with the discharge of their spiritual functions.

. For continuation of Debate see next Number, Series XXII, now ready.

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

PAPAL AGGRESSION.—HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FEB. 12, 1851.

(Continuation of Debate from the Twenty-first Series.)

Mr. P. H. HOWARD, in continuation, said, the Home Secretary had roundly charged the Roman Catholics with being guilty of an act of aggression in the recent change; but against the opinion of the right hon. gentleman he would set that of a nobleman, once Secretary for Ireland—a nobleman who had earned for himself a decided reputation, even in the estimate of his opponents, during his administration of the affairs of Ireland, and who had gained a European reputation by that noble treaty known as the Elliot Convention, which limited the sad horrors of an unnatural contest, and led to a system more in accordance with the legitimate principles of regular warfare. [The hon. gentleman here read some passages from the pamphlet of the Earl of St. Germans, to the effect that, as we gave nothing to the Roman Catholic Church in England beyond the toleration extended to every religious body, so we should not interfere with its internal organisation, any more than we interfered with that of Protestant Dissenters, and that the law ought to ignore the existence of a Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, or Bishop of Plymouth, just as it had hitherto ignored the office of vicars-apostolic.] The opinion of so enlightened a nobleman might, he thought, be weighed against that of the Home Secretary, or of any other gentleman who had characterised the late Papal act as an aggression. But what had the celebrated Lord Castlereagh said upon the question of a Catholic hierarchy? He argued against the idea “that any evil or difficulty arose from the existence of the Roman Catholic Church in an episcopal form in Ireland. On the contrary, he was of opinion that the power of governing incident to bishops was in itself *pro tanto* a salutary reduction of the external authority of the See of Rome, and that he much preferred the ministry of bishops to that of vicars-apostolic, who were merely missionaries removable at pleasure, and bound implicitly to obey all orders from the Pope.” No language could be more apposite to the present occasion than this, though it was spoken many years ago. The argument used by Cardinal Wiseman in his appeal to the people of England, that the title and office of bishop was not a dignity in the sense in which the Sovereign was said to be the fountain of honour and dignity, had never yet been refuted by any speaker or writer on this question; and he was certainly surprised to hear the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Wood) assert that it was impossible for a bishop to be created without the sanction of the Crown. He must have forgotten that for the first 300 years of the Church the Christian religion and Christian forms were maintained in direct opposition to the Imperial Government. During those 300 years every emperor held the title of Pontifex Maximus, and bitterly persecuted all Christians, who, while they gave obedience in matters temporal, held their religious opinions and followed the forms of their Church in defiance of the secular power. As a case in point, St. Augustine, in our own country, was bishop some time before the conversion of Ethelred had converted the people of England to the Christian religion. When it was asserted that the Pope claimed the rule over all England, he would, in refutation of that statement, refer to the letters apostolic of the Pope himself, from which it was evident that the Supreme Pontiff did not speak of England as England, but simply with reference to those professing the Roman Catholic belief. Instead of being aggressive, it spoke only of the increasing numbers of Catholics in this country, and of the necessity that existed for their being under the sole government of bishops deriving their titles and their particular cures from places connected with kindred and home names. But it was said this was an attempt to supersede the government of the bishops of the Established Church. Now, no such accusation was made in the case of Canada, where by express treaty the Catholic religion was recognised. The Catholic religion was as much established in Lower Canada as was the Protestant religion by the laws of this country. There was a Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec, and there was a Protestant bishop, with continerminous jurisdiction. This showed that we had not acted up everywhere to those vigorous principles which it was fancied had been laid down upon this matter. In other countries the course pursued by Catholics in this country was followed out. There was a Latin Patriarch at Constantinople, who exercised his functions without giving any offence to the Ottoman Porte; and at Antioch there were three patriarchs belonging to the Syriac, the Greek, and the Latin Churches. Much had been said with reference to the pastoral which had been recently issued; but that pastoral was addressed, not to the people of England, but to the clergy, secular and regular, and the faithful of the archdiocese. It was an address that applied exclusively to Catholics, and it would be acknowledged as an axiom that a legal document could affect those only to whom it was addressed. The highest and greatest authority—it he might without impiety quote His words on that occasion—had said, “Whose superscription is this?” the Saviour of mankind having thus declared that to be the manner in which the

definition of a document could be rightly interpreted. The much-abused pastoral was addressed to the members of the Catholic faith, and to them alone, and if any further corroborative testimony was required, it must be found in those emphatic prayers that were directed to be recited after the sacrifice of the mass, and which certainly the Prime Minister could not say were intended for those of any other but the Catholic creed. From the observations of the legal officers of the Crown upon this measure, it appeared to be one that interfered with some of the most important charities and trusts in the country. It was a measure which involved an aggression upon the private rights of property more unjust than any that had ever been attempted since he had had the honour of a seat in that House. But he ventured to tell the Government that not only their legal ingenuity but their physical endurance would be highly tested before they were able to carry into effect this persecuting enactment. He would say that protection, as between their bishops and themselves, the Roman Catholics needed none; and if the Prime Minister should have been led to suppose that they did so, the address which had been presented to Cardinal Wiseman with the authority of the Catholic bishops and their most distinguished laymen would most decidedly contravene that fact. Protection they required none; they only asked to enjoy their religious liberty in an unendowed Church, which claimed nothing from this country but that toleration which would permit them to maintain its own creed and defend it against that of others when attacked—and might God defend the right! So convinced was he of the justice of his cause, and of its high and impregnable position, that, humble as he was, he had not flinched from encountering, and, he believed, answering, the arguments of the First Minister of the Crown. He only claimed for his poorer fellow-religionists that toleration which he was willing to concede to all, and if he had said aught to hurt the creed of anyone it had been most alien to his thoughts. He had only sought to vindicate his own creed, and he trusted he should never say anything that would violate the sanctity of the temple of religious freedom.

Mr. NAPIER observed, that the only question now before them was, whether her Majesty's Ministers should have leave to introduce a bill on the subject of Papal aggression. In the absence of a knowledge of the particular provisions of the measure, it would be unwise, as well as unjust to the Government and the country, to enter by anticipation into a discussion of the enactments which might be found in it. But it certainly was somewhat strange, after Parliament had assured her Majesty that they would devote their best consideration to any measure that might be laid before them by the Government on the subject of Papal aggression that they should now be engaged in discussing for the third day whether any measure should be laid before them; and whether they should legislate at all upon the subject. Although he had heard this aggression of the Pope of Rome palliated, excused, and explained, he had not heard it defended or justified. It was no question of theological controversy. Relieving it from all the surge of excitement thrown around it, and what had they? They had on the one side the claim of a foreign prelate of a right to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the territories of the British Sovereign, to which on the other side were opposed the principles of the British constitution. It was contended that such a claim on the part of the Pope was incompatible with that constitution, and upon that issue was joined; and thereupon the Government brought in a bill for the purpose, not of infringing on religious liberty, but of embodying and giving effect to the feelings of the whole people of this country; backed by the highest authorities, by the universities, by the Church, by the bar of England, and by another authority, to which he would not more particularly refer, but which was justly entitled to the greatest consideration; backed, too, by a man of the first legal eminence—he meant Sir E. Sugden, who, in a speech of unparalleled ability, stated his calm and deliberate opinion to be that the aggression of the Bishop of Rome was incompatible with the constitution of this country and in direct collision with, and antagonistic to, the existing laws of the land. If that were so, if the people of this country, if the Church of this country, if the Church of Scotland, and if the Nonconformists all agreed, with one voice and heart, in an endeavour to prevent this aggression—if the bar of England said it was an aggression; and if that eminent man, Sir E. Sugden, coming from the calm retirement of his closet—a man unequalled as a lawyer, and, as a judge, none more competent to give an opinion upon a great constitutional question—if he said “that though the law on this point is certainly in a very anomalous state, and, I grieve to say, reflects no credit on the Legislature, but nevertheless I am of opinion that the law has been infringed by the Bishop of Rome and Cardinal Wiseman;” while he gave expression to such an opinion as to the law being unsatisfactory and anomalous, owing to clumsy legislation, yet that eminent lawyer added that this act of the Pope was an invasion of the law, and that it certainly called upon Parliament to make the law clear and explicit—to examine its foundation, and see that its enactments were such as would raise an effectual barrier against any future aggressions. If, then, this was an aggression against international law, was not the Government at liberty to introduce a measure to repress that aggression? Was the House to be belied in this way? Was the country to be belied, when it demanded a legislative enactment to suppress a proceeding which was against the reasonable, the religious, and the constitutional feelings of the country—against the peace of her Majesty herself, and against the greatest body of testimony that was ever afforded by a nation blessed with the light and the privileges of the Reformation upon a subject so dear to their hearts, and which was so bound up not only with the happiness of this country, but he would add with the hopes of the civilised world? He could frankly and candidly say, whatever might have been his opinion on the subject of Roman Catholic emancipation (and that opinion still remained

unchanged), that he was prepared to take his stand upon the act of 1829; and he would say to those who were opposed to the present measure, "Convince me that this proposed measure of legislation is adverse to the act of 1829, and I will give my vote against it." The first argument adduced against the measure was that it was in violation of the principles of what was called civil and religious liberty. But what did those gentlemen who urged that argument mean by civil and religious liberty? He would say in answer to that argument, that it was merely begging the question, because, if these acts on the part of Rome were an invasion of the constitution of the country, the best guarantee for civil and religious liberty was to preserve unbroken that constitution, and to throw its shelter over the laity of every denomination. If they asked the Roman Catholic laity to obey their laws, they were bound in return to throw over them the shelter of the constitution of the country, and to take care that no supremacy should rise above the fixed and settled constitution of the country. He apprehended that some legislation was necessary because this was an attempt to introduce, by foreign authority, into this country, laws which should rise above the constitutional law of the land, and bearing with them an authority not only over the property but over the consciences of her Majesty's subjects. He would say, that for the sake of one portion of her Majesty's subjects—the Roman Catholic laity—some legislative measure was absolutely required, as that class were in a position in which they could not speak freely and openly for themselves. If the law and constitution would not protect them, what was there to give them protection? He had lately read a letter written by a Roman Catholic, in which he commented upon the proceedings of the Synod of Thurles, and he declared those proceedings to be downright persecution of the Catholic laity of Ireland. Many Roman Catholics had told him (Mr. Napier) the same thing. It was a species of tyranny exercised over them, and yet they had not any power to resist the oppression. The hon. member who last addressed the House said that the Synod of Thurles had done no more than the bishops of the Established Church had done, and that they had only exercised a proper authority on the subject of national education; but he (Mr. Napier) would ask that hon. gentleman whether he ever knew the bishops of the Established Church say to any of their laity, "If you do not obey us and submit to our opinions we will cut you off from all communion with the Church?" "The controversy is decided; you have no right to express your opinion." "The judge hath spoken." The expression was not—"You may duly exercise your own judgment:" that would be perfectly fair. But the people were so much the vassals of that synod that they had no power to express an independent opinion on any of its proceedings. Nay, some of its decisions had been stated to have been carried under such powerful influence on the part of the Holy See that many of the bishops themselves surrendered their own opinions, and yielded to a power they felt themselves unable to resist. The plain common sense of all this was, that the Roman Catholic Church said to Protestant England, "Make what enactments you like, propound what policy you like, their whole force and sanction must be derived from the Papal authority." Under such a system what became of a popularly free people? Was it not a solemn mockery to call a people free who could be ground down by such tyranny? He would maintain, therefore, that the proposed measure was not only a just and wise measure, but that it was a merciful measure. He had no controversy on this subject; he had no theological opinions to uphold respecting it. Many Roman Catholics were in their hearts desirous that a measure of this kind should be passed. There were many Roman Catholics among his constituents, and several had spoken to him on the subject, and had expressed their hope that he would do whatever might be right in order to prevent this tyranny coming upon them, and interfering with those liberties which were dearest to their hearts. The hon. member for Manchester (Mr. Bright) had said that a great influx of Popery had come from Ireland, and particularly into Lancashire; and he observed that our policy in Ireland had fostered Popery there, and that this influx was only an act of retributive justice. He (Mr. Napier) agreed with the hon. gentleman that the legislative policy of the Government had been favourable to Popery; but was that an argument why they should not legislate against ecclesiastical usurpation? No; he would say, "Change your policy, not only in your legislation, but in your mode of government also." For he believed that if, with their system of governing Ireland, their measures of legislation had been more favourable to Protestantism, it would have brought the two principles of Popery and Protestantism into open collision. The hon. member for Dublin (Mr. Reynolds) the other night alleged that all the Government patronage in Ireland was bestowed on Protestants; and then the hon. gentleman gave a statistical account of the manner in which the law patronage was bestowed. But the hon. gentleman was not remarkable for his accuracy in figures. On one occasion the hon. gentleman put forth a statement as to the amount of the property of the prelates of the Established Church in Ireland, and when asked for his authority, he said he had obtained his information from the Stamp-office in Dublin. That, however, was an error, there being no such returns from that office; but certain information was to be obtained from the Prerogative-office. Well, on comparison of the hon. gentleman's statement with that which was procured from the Prerogative-office, the difference in the amount was no less than 768,808*l.* He (Mr. Napier) would not enter into an examination of the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement with regard to the courts of law, but he would say that in Ireland it was a disqualification to be a Protestant. Take, for example, the bar. Two of the most distinguished members of the Munster circuit had retired—Mr. Henn and Mr. Bennett—and those gentlemen were Protestants, but neither of them had been promoted. Many gentlemen who enjoyed the largest confidence and had the greatest business at

the bar were Protestants, and had been entirely passed over; while he would defy the hon. gentleman to tell him of an instance, since 1829, in which a single Roman Catholic had been passed over. That was not the way in which the patronage of the Government ought to be administered. The right hon. baronet (Sir G. Grey) had endeavoured to make an elaborate defence of the policy of the Government of Ireland, and particularly with regard to certain communications held with the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Such a defence was absolutely required, because, whether rightly or wrongly, they were bound to admit that the public feeling throughout England and Ireland was, that the policy which the Government had pursued in that country had been altogether to encourage the demands of the Papacy; and, however wrong the conduct adopted by the Pope might be, he (Mr. Napier) must say on his behalf, that he was well encouraged to take the step he did by the policy which the British Government had pursued since 1847, both in Ireland and in the colonies. There were documents to which he would but briefly refer, as hon. gentlemen could easily have access to them. In Lord Grey's letter of 1847, addressed to the colonial Governments, he stated that the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland had declared that the Bequests Act had given rank to Roman Catholic bishops. So, in 1847, also Dr. Wiseman said that the vicars-apostolic met in London to arrange the establishment of the hierarchy in England. Lord Clarendon's construction of the Bequests Act was that the Catholic archbishops and bishops were entitled to be called "Your grace," and "Your lordship." Now he (Mr. Napier) had always been in the habit of treating those persons with that courtesy and respect which properly belonged to their social position in the community; but he did not think it a right or wise thing either to violate the law of the land or to depart from the usages of society by giving those persons a false position. For see the predicament in which those who did so were themselves placed. If they intended to go on saying to those persons, "We do not believe in your religion—we believe that it is calculated to enslave the intellect and confine the soul," and at the same time went on putting them on a level with the peers of the realm, and placing them in a position which neither her Majesty nor the law had given them, the inference would be that either they were not honest in rejecting the doctrines of those men, or that they were politically afraid of them. By inducing the Roman Catholics to entertain that opinion of the Government, he would say that the Government was guilty of encouraging them to take every means for setting up an ecclesiastical organisation in this country, by which they might seek to prevail over the religion of the people, and most injuriously affect their social interests and everything which Englishmen could or ought to prize. It was with great pain that he read the letter addressed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to the Roman Catholic Archbishop Murray in 1848. Was this great country to put itself in the humiliating position of the Queen's representative sending over for the consideration of the Pope a statute relating to the colleges for the education of the middle classes in Ireland? That letter was taken to Rome by Dr. Murray, and it was very curious that in his letter, published at Rome in 1848, of which he (Mr. Napier) had a translation from the Italian original, Dr. Murray was very anxious to induce the Court of Rome to accede to the proposition of the English Government. In that letter Dr. Murray took a general view of the policy of the Government of England towards the Roman Catholics for the last thirty years, to show how favourable was that policy to the Church of Rome. In every succeeding session laws were introduced favourable to the interests and views of the Catholics. The writer enumerated the various measures that had been passed, such as the striking off of ten bishops from the Protestant Church in Ireland; the withholding from Protestants any share in the public grant for the purposes of education; the giving to Maynooth 30,000*l.* a-year for the ecclesiastical education of the Roman Catholics. This would give an idea of what these people themselves thought with regard to the policy of this country. If, then, the Government was now about to assume the attitude of independence, let them in God's name take that attitude, and not ask the leave of the Pope to enact statutes, not crouch at his feet, and seek his permission to enforce their own laws. After briefly adverting to the letter of Dr. Wiseman, the hon. and learned gentleman concluded by saying that it appeared to him that there were some subjects of serious consideration which were not touched upon in the bill; but a proper time would arrive for noticing that matter. The hon. and learned member for Youghal had given notice that he should propose that Ireland should be excluded from the operation of this measure. Whenever that proposition should be made he (Mr. Napier) should be prepared to take the case of Ireland in hand, and join issue with the hon. gentleman upon that question.

Mr. KEOGH remarked, that the hon. and learned member who had just spoken was once secretary to the Brunswick Clubs of Ireland, which were founded on the principle of defiance to any Act of Parliament which had the emancipation of the Catholics for its object, and yet he now came down to that House and lectured Catholics on the impropriety of opposing the penal measure proposed by the Government, and on their general want of independence of spiritual influence. After lamenting the loss of that great statesman, Sir R. Peel, whose loss was never more severely felt than at the present moment, and to whose absence, he firmly believed, the country was indebted for the wretched attack on religious liberty now made by the Government, the hon. gentleman proceeded to controvert the statement of the hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin, that the profession of Protestantism was a bar to promotion in Ireland, by recapitulating the following facts:—Of the twelve judges in Ireland three only were Catholics; the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, although he had no Church patronage to dispense or ecclesiastical functions to perform, could not be held by a Catholic; the Master of the Rolls was a Protestant; of five Masters in Chancery, four were Protestants; there

were two judges of the Bankruptcy Courts, both Protestants; of 33 assistant-barristers 25 were Protestants; for the stipendiary magistracy Protestants were selected in the proportion of three to one; the Attorney-General was a Protestant; and of the three law advisers of the Irish Government, two were Protestants. Leaving these particulars, he would now advert to an extraordinary circumstance which the noble lord at the head of the Government had referred to in the course of his speech. The noble lord asserted that the Roman Catholic clergymen had refused to administer the sacrament to the late Sardinian Minister. He (Mr. Keogh) was not prepared to deny that assertion, for he knew nothing of the fact; but, presuming that the noble lord spoke from authority, and that the fact was undeniable, he would say, speaking as a Roman Catholic in the presence of Roman Catholic members, that he could conceive nothing more atrocious or more deserving the reprobation of all good men. He could not believe it possible that a similar occurrence would take place in these kingdoms, but if it should, he was sure it would be met by the Roman Catholics in the same spirit of resistance with which at an earlier period of our history they had opposed other acts of attempted tyranny. He repudiated the notion that Roman Catholics submitted to the opinions of their priests in temporal matters. If any Cardinal or Pope, home priest or foreign priest, should attempt to interfere in his private affairs, or tamper with the allegiance due to the laws of this country, he would treat the attempt with scorn. Now, with respect to the measure of the Government, if he could bring himself to believe that the grounds on which it was based—namely, that the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was an insult to the Sovereign and country, and an illegal assumption of power, he would be disposed to support it. In private life the intention of an act was deemed to be its very essence, when one came to decide whether or not it was an insult. The noble lord at the head of the Government denied the other night that his letter, which had been circulating in Ireland for months previously, was intended as an insult to the Catholic religion. Of course he believed the noble lord, but why did not the noble lord allow the same privilege of explanation to Roman Catholics, and believe them when they declared that no insult was intended by recent acts? The language used by the noble lord on previous occasions, to which the hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin had adverted, must necessarily have prepared the Pope to believe that the Government would approve the course which he had taken. If that were so—and no one had yet attempted to deny it—he called upon every rational man to ask himself this question: “How could the Pope mean to insult this country by an act which he had every reason to believe would be acceptable to the Ministers of the Crown?” The hon. and learned member for Oxford said, the other night, that the law had been violated by the assumption of territorial titles by the Catholic prelates. Upon this point the hon. and learned member was at issue with the Attorney and Solicitor-General, for the noble lord distinctly told the House that he had consulted the law officers of the Crown, who were both of opinion that the statute law had not been violated by that proceeding. The hon. and learned member for Oxford said that the creation of prelates was a privilege exclusively vested in the Queen, and that therefore the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy was an invasion of her prerogative; but he denied that the creation of bishoprics, even in the Church of England, of which the Queen was supreme head—although that was disputed by some of the episcopal bench—rested with the Sovereign. An Act of Henry VIII. gave the Crown the power of appointing bishops, but that Act was repealed, and no such power now vested in the Sovereign. A late Act of Parliament, applying to the colonies, the 5th of Victoria, gave power to her Majesty to create bishops of the Church of England in foreign countries, a power, it was hardly necessary to observe, which it was unnecessary to confer upon the Queen by Act of Parliament if it were already vested in her Majesty in right of her prerogative. Here he might be allowed to refer to an incident connected with the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829. It was well known that this act contained a clause prohibiting Roman Catholic bishops from adopting the title of any existing sees of the Church of England. When the Emancipation Bill was passing through the House the hon. baronet the member for the University of Oxford proposed to make the clause in question more stringent, by making it applicable to the very case that had recently occurred; but his proposition was rejected. In the other House, a peer proposed that cardinals and Roman Catholic bishops should be excluded, in the event of their becoming members of the peerage; but this proposition was opposed by the Dukes of Wellington and Richmond, and unanimously rejected. In the teeth of these facts, how could it be contended that either the common or statute law had been invaded by the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy? The hon. and learned member for Oxford said that the new prelates had assumed territorial power. What territorial power, he begged to ask, did any Roman Catholic bishop now possess? Did his title give him power over person or property? Could he draw a sixpence of revenue from any individual, or compel any Roman Catholic to do anything against his will? One of the chapters of Sir James Macintosh’s “History of England” contained a passage referring to the spiritual ascendancy of Catholic clergymen to this effect:—“The spiritual supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church means nothing but ascendancy over the minds of those who voluntarily submit to it.” He had referred to former briefs of the Pope appointing apostolic vicars, and he found that they contained every word used in the recent brief. Then what mighty danger was contained in the word “diocese” which was not to be found in the word “district?” Where was the territorial assumption in the one which was not in the other? But was there no precedent for such a proceeding? The noble lord in his letter, which his best friends wished he had never written, said that there was no similarity

between the appointment of Scotch bishops and the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The noble lord could not have had the Attorney-General by him when he made that assertion. That legal functionary would have remembered that the first anti-prelatic statute was passed in Scotland in 1689, that it was enforced in 1690, and that by the crowning statute of 1707, not only was episcopacy for ever abolished in Scotland, but Presbyterianism was made the established religion of the country. The Queen swore, at her coronation, to respect those statutes, and yet—even since the terrible Papal aggression—the Protestant bishops of Scotland had addressed the Crown in their episcopal character, and their petition had been most graciously received. Her Majesty, he perceived, had also most graciously received another address from twenty-eight bishops of the Church of England, in which those meek prelates, who stood up for religious toleration, described the religion of 10,000,000 of their fellow subjects, and 200,000,000 of the human race, as a tissue of blasphemous fables. He saw the noble lord consulting with the Secretary for the Home Department about this matter.

Sir G. GREY—No such address has ever been received by her Majesty.

Mr. KEOGH—Yes, it has. I have a copy here, and will read it.

Sir G. GREY—The hon. member must be referring to an address from the Scotch to the English bishops.

Mr. KEOGH—It is an address from the Christian Knowledge Society.

Sir G. GREY was understood to say that an address had been received from that society.

Mr. KEOGH said it appeared, then, that he was right. At a former, but not very distant period, the noble lord and the right hon. baronet declined to receive an address signed "John Archbishop of Tuam," on the ground that the adoption of that title was contrary to the provisions of the Emancipation Act; but they had no objection to receive an address signed by the Bishops of Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Argyle, although the recognition of those titles was contrary to the statutes of Scotland, and in direct contravention of the oath taken by the Queen at her coronation to respect the statutes of the realm. Of course he did not complain of Lord Grey's circular to the colonies, or Lord Clarendon's letter to the Pope; but after the Government had, by these and innumerable other acts of a similar character, led the head of the Catholic Church to believe that what he had done would be highly acceptable to them, to turn round and meet it with a penal statute was indeed a monstrous proceeding. It was impossible to deny that the acts of the Government, for a series of years, had led not only the Catholics of England and Ireland, but the See of Rome, to believe that the step which had been taken would not be unacceptable to her Majesty's Ministers. Reference had, it was true, been made to an answer given by the noble lord to a question proposed to him, in which he said he would not give his consent to the establishment of a Catholic hierarchy. That could easily be accounted for. When the noble lord gave that answer he was First Minister of the Crown, but when he made the important declarations he was about to read to the House the noble lord was in opposition. On the 13th of February, 1844, the noble lord said, in that House:—

"I think we ought to take away everything derogatory to the position and character of the Roman Catholic bishops. You provide by statute that they shall not be allowed to style themselves by the name of the diocese over which they preside. I think that a most foolish prohibition."

A most foolish prohibition! Why, that was the very thing which the noble lord was now asking the House to do! In 1845 party animosities ran higher, and the Irish members had to be gained and Ireland to be brought to the scratch; and that great statesman whose loss universal Europe deplored was to be turned out of office; and then the noble lord went a little further, and said, "I believe that we might repeal those disallowing clauses which prevent a Roman Catholic bishop assuming a title held by a bishop of the Established Church. I cannot conceive any good ground for the continuance of this restriction." Yet those restrictive clauses, which the noble lord found it absolutely impossible to conceive any justification for, he now proposed to reimpose and make more stringent! Once more, on the 5th of February, 1846, the noble lord made a pithy observation, which included the whole question; he said, "As to preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing can be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction." It must be consolatory to the noble lord to have received the grateful thanks of the hon. baronet the member for Oxford University for what he was now doing. The noble lord had during his public life distinguished himself as the advocate of religious liberty. The hon. baronet, on the other hand, had often been described—and by the noble lord himself—as the consistent, persevering supporter of—he used the term without meaning offence—bigotry. When he saw the noble lord and the hon. baronet now pursuing the same course, hand in hand, he could not help looking on the conjunction as an extraordinary and ominous one. The noble lord insisted very strongly the other night on the evils resulting from the Synod of Thurles. To hear the noble lord speak, one would have supposed that the Synod of Thurles had not been held when he wrote his famous letter; whereas it had taken place months previously. The noble lord in his letter alluded to many other things, but not to the Synod of Thurles, although one would have supposed that it would have been the circumstance most prominent in the thoughts of the Prime Minister. So far were the educated Catholics from being disposed to approve of what was done in the Synod of Thurles, the most distinguished members of that body were about to publish a paper expressive of their opinions on the subject, and condemning any interference by the clergy in temporal affairs, when they were stopped by the appearance of the noble

lord's extraordinary letter. Having now gone through most of the general topics to which he wished to allude, he would appeal to the noble lord with respect to some details of the measure before the House. Had the noble lord maturely considered what would be the effect of his proposition with respect to Ireland? He did not mean its effect on public opinion. The noble lord could possibly afford to disregard the public opinion of Ireland, though there was a time when he thought it necessary to court it. But he was not alluding to that. What he asked was, had the noble lord considered the absolute working effect of the measure on the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland? He believed, and he had mentioned his apprehensions to several hon. members, who said that they had not considered the matter before, and who seemed somewhat startled by it; he believed that if the noble lord carried his bill it would have the effect of stopping the ecclesiastical functions of the Catholic Church in Ireland. There was a venerable prelate in the House the other night, a prelate who had never taken part in political agitations, and who had never assumed any of the titles against which this enactment was directed [Dr. M'Gottigan we believe], and the opinion of that prelate, after carefully listening to the details of the proposition, was, that without violating the law, which he would not do, he would be unable to exercise his episcopal functions if the bill were carried. Was the noble lord prepared for this consequence of his measure? Was he prepared to rouse the fell spirit of religious hate which had almost subsided in that country? Had he taken counsel with the Attorney-General on the subject, and had he asked that dignified and learned person whether, if the prelates of the Catholic Church in Ireland should be so pertinacious, obstinate, and daring as to disobey the law, he was prepared to frame an indictment against the ecclesiastical superiors of 6,000,000 people? Was he prepared to send his Protestant Attorney-General and his Roman Catholic Solicitor-General to conduct the prosecution and bring the Archbishop of Tuam before a jury in the county of Mayo? He had no desire to incite the noble lord to institute criminal prosecutions; on the contrary, he thought he would be wise to refrain from them; but he did ask the Government not to encumber the statute-book with laws which were not intended to be put into execution; and, if it was intended to put this act into execution, he asked the noble lord again, was he prepared to place the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland in the felon's dock for disobeying it? He would conclude by reminding the noble lord of certain words which he (Lord J. Russell) had addressed to his predecessor in office, that "a just retribution would overtake the man who, not appealing to sound and enlightened public opinion, laid hold of some popular prejudice or mistaken notion in order to ground his power upon deluding and misleading the people."

Mr. ANSTAY considered the case which the hon. and learned gentleman had made out in behalf of excluding Ireland altogether from the bill was unanswerable. The hon. member for Meath (Mr. Grattan), when speaking on this question the other evening, expressed his regret that the Emancipation Bill of 1813 did not receive the royal assent. By whom was that bill recommended? By the Pope. He held in his hand an extract from the current history of the period, from which it appeared, that although there was great reason to apprehend that the Catholic bishops of Ireland were in favour of the view expressed by the Court of Rome, first the laity, and then the clergy, unanimously passed resolutions declaring that the document from Rome was non-mandatory, and not entitled to their obedience and respect. So strong was the pressure of public opinion on the subject that the bishops also met and unanimously voted that the Papal rescript was not mandatory nor obligatory on their obedience. What was the consequence? No sooner did the Court of Rome receive the intelligence of the unanimous and patriotic disobedience of the clergy and laity of Ireland than the cardinals met too, and unanimously came to the resolution that in no way would they for a temporal advantage insist upon the measure. That was the way the Court of Rome was met when it attempted to dictate to the Roman Catholics of Ireland in 1813. Since that period no similar attempt had been made by that Court to dictate to the people of Ireland. The object of the present bill being to redress a grievance which had occurred in England, he could not understand upon what principle clauses had been introduced applying to Ireland. He would repeat what he had said on a former occasion, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland were entitled by canon law to resist any attempt of the character of the late letters apostolic by which a new hierarchy was created in England. The Irish clergy were empowered by their present constitution to do everything at home for themselves, and they had no occasion to go to Rome, except as a last resort. The titles which it was proposed to prohibit by this bill as regarded Ireland were titles not imposed by a foreign prince, but assumed by British subjects. Why should not British subjects in Ireland be allowed to assume titles of the same character which were allowed to be assumed with impunity by British subjects in Scotland? The bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland would still be allowed to style themselves bishops of their respective sees without permission of the Crown; and why? Because the titles were not imposed by a foreign prince. Well, that was the case with the Irish prelates too, though it was not the case with the English hierarchy created by the letters apostolical of last year. Now, this obvious distinction was entirely lost sight of in the proposed bill. He maintained that they ought not to interfere with the liberty of every man in this country—subject, of course, to the courts of justice and the departments of State refusing their recognition—to assume what titles he pleased. Suppose some one were to assume a *pseudo* title of nobility, would he be prosecuted for it? Not if he alleged he had any right whatever to it, because no court of justice would preclude the possibility of his establishing his title before the House of Lords by entertaining a prosecution. To attempt to interfere with titles assumed by Romish bishops

in England would, be contended, be useless and trivial—to do so in Ireland would be mischievous and oppressive. The Government were mistaken in supposing that territorial titles were essential to hierarchical and synodical action. To forbid the assumption of territorial titles, therefore, would not prevent the bishops from dealing with the temporalities of the Church. By a clause in the Pope's brief, which seemed to have escaped notice, the powers of vicars-apostolic were continued to the new bishops, and, as vicars-apostolic, they would be able to enjoy that power and liberty of action which it was the intention of the new constitution to confer upon them. The bill was, therefore, defective in this respect. It was defective in another point, because it dealt only with the case of future temporalities. How was it possible to deal with the difficulty which he suggested on a former occasion, viz., that it would be impossible for any court of law or equity, unless authorised by Act of Parliament, to refuse the assistance of their own writs for the purpose of enforcing the letters apostolic of the Pope with regard to existing trusts? For instance, the property of the Scotch Church was governed by the temporal law of the land, acting in aid of the private law of that Church, as altered or amended from time to time by its General Assembly. At one time the General Assembly passed a law recognising the independence of the branch of the Scotch Church existing in England. Now, it happened that when the disruption of the Church of Scotland took place a few years ago, a vast majority of the Scotch Presbyterians in England adopted a resolution expressive of sympathy with the Free Church party. The Church of Scotland subsequently rescinded the act by which the independence of the English Presbyterian body was guaranteed; and the consequence had been that the English Court of Chancery in three cases, apparently against the private opinion of the judges, had been obliged, such was the infirmity of our legislation on such subjects, to eject every minister and trustee who happened to entertain a speculative opinion in favour of the Free Church of Scotland. In a case like the present it was not important to bear in mind that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was only a contemplated hierarchy; no hierarchy was established in this country, because none could be established without the previous establishment of the canon law, and, as the canon law did not exist in England, therefore he was justified in saying that no hierarchy had been established. The thing by some apprehended was the establishment in this country by the Court of Rome of what might fairly enough be called an autocracy; and in noticing this part of the subject, he might observe that there was a clause in the brief preventing the establishment of the canon law. As to the proposed bill of the noble lord, it was said that the general clause was a matter of form, but that he begged leave altogether to deny. Perhaps it might be in a certain sense a matter of form, but it was also a matter of substance, in its nature very material and important. He must say that if it had devolved on him to prepare a measure of this class or description, or if he were then to say what sort of bill he should be prepared to support, he could have no hesitation in declaring it to be one which would not interfere with any class of her Majesty's subjects. But as to any danger to this country from the proceedings of the Court of Rome, there did not appear to him the least ground for apprehending that that danger was otherwise than imaginary; and if he saw any ground for it he should certainly support such restrictions as would go far to render it impossible; and he should likewise be disposed to support measures for vesting in lay persons the management of charities, with a view to prevent its being supposed that the Church of Rome did or could exercise any influence in the administration of trust funds in this country. Further, the House should remember that the prohibition contained in the Emancipation Act was not the only thing which rendered the assumption of titles illegal. The existence of Roman Catholic bishops or archbishops, either in England or Ireland, was formerly illegal, and it was not the mere assumption of titles that constituted the illegality; but under the Act of 1791, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, for example, had a perfect right to the title which he bore, for the Act of 1791 gave that title to every duly qualified and registered prelate of the Church of Rome. With regard to the English Roman Catholics, he thought himself justified in saying that they desired to see Parliament legislating, not, perhaps, in the spirit of the bill of the noble lord, but in one sense in a stronger, though in a different, way. As respected himself, he could not conclude without noticing the circumstance that he had been blamed for the distinction which he had taken between the Court of Rome and the Church of Rome—a distinction which he conceived to be real, and which he thought was sufficiently intelligible. And now he should state in a few words the course which, practically, he meant to pursue. He should move the omission of every clause in the bill relating to Ireland, and he should also use his utmost endeavours to amend the bill for the benefit of the English Roman Catholics, their liberties, properties, and rights. In justice to himself, he felt bound also to say, that he did not participate in the denunciations which had been levelled against the noble lord for deserting those principles of civil and religious liberty which he had always maintained, and with regard to which he must still be considered consistent.

Mr. SPOONER said he had no intention of following the last speaker through the course of observations which he had addressed to the House, and he should perhaps not that day have addressed the House if it had not been for the challenge which was put forth by the hon. member for Carlisle. Still he should trouble the House with only one or two remarks on a discussion that had now, he might say, occupied them for several days. The question was, should they, or should they not, then proceed to consider as a question for decision whether they would adopt a measure which they had already pledged themselves to carry out? Surely it was not the way for them to carry out that promise thus to enter into the mere details of the

bill, and that, too, of a bill not yet before them. On the whole, then, he was of opinion that it would be better as speedily as possible to close the debate for the present, and without further delay to let the noble lord lay his bill upon the table of the House. As he had risen he would avail himself of that opportunity to thank the noble lord for the frank and straightforward letter that he had written, as well as for the bold and manly tone of that speech with which he had introduced the measure to the notice of the House. If the noble lord found himself in any difficulties out of the House, he (Mr. Spooner) should still call on him to stand by the speech he had made and the letter he had written. Finally, if the noble lord were unfairly pressed, he should recommend him to throw himself on the Protestant feeling of the people of this great country, who would not allow their Queen to be insulted and their principles outraged. In the course of the present discussion some fault had been found with the language of one of the addresses presented to the Queen; but he must be allowed to remind the House that that language was derived from the Articles of the Church. With regard to the meeting at Birmingham he wished to say a few words. It was a very large and influential meeting, at which, no doubt, there was a difference of opinion and some confusion. An amendment was moved, which was negatived by a very large majority, who then quitted the meeting, inasmuch as they considered that a rejection of the amendment amounted to an adoption of the original proposition. In fact, the question was one on which there existed all but perfect unanimity—a unanimity of opinion clearly in favour of our Protestant institutions. The noble lord had well begun the work which he had undertaken, and it was to be hoped that he would go on in the same path. If he did so he might rely on the support of the people at large as well as of the House of Commons. He trusted that the noble lord would excuse him if he said that the explanation which he gave of the bill and the second explanation given by the Attorney-General had fallen considerably short of the expectations entertained by the public. He trusted, however, that when the bill came before the House it would exceed such explanations as far as they fell short of the noble lord's letter and speech. Again he would advise the noble lord, if he encountered any difficulty, to throw himself on the country.

Mr. A. B. HOPE said he could not record the vote which he intended to give against the bill without some explanation. He confessed that in listening to the speech of the learned Attorney-General he experienced no small degree of surprise at the petty details into which he entered, and he also could not help feeling much surprise that the noble lord should have brought forward such a measure under the peculiar circumstances which now existed. As to the speech of the hon. and learned member for Oxford, it might have suited the member for the University of Oxford, but it ill became the known principles of the hon. and learned gentleman by whom it was delivered. There was in it much against Papal aggression, but not a word in favour of the bill. What was so likely to foster the priestly tyranny of which the laity of the Roman Catholic Church were said to complain as legislation that would compel their synodical action to be clandestine, and their briefs to be circulated surreptitiously, instead of being published in the face of day and exposed to the searching examination of the public press? The synods might not be held in the new cathedral in Westminster, but they would be held in a house next door to it. Such legislation would be simply and absolutely inoperative, and would only aggravate those dangers affecting the Roman Catholic laity which it was so very convenient to the noble lord to bring forward and sympathise with. There was only one thing the Roman Catholic hierarchy wanted, and that was position. That which they had to make for themselves the noble lord with an unwilling generosity had made for them. By this tedious, vexatious, inoperative persecution he had, with little danger to the Roman hierarchy, put them upon a pedestal of easy martyrdom. The noble lord had visited them with just enough of persecution to make them interesting to their flocks, and to give them that position of dignity which it might have taken them some time to achieve for themselves. A few years ago a bill was brought in to restore diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome. That bill recognised the Pope as a Sovereign Pontiff, and if it had been passed it would have been the duty of the Pope to communicate to the British Government everything, even purely spiritual, which might affect this country. But that appellation was struck out, and by the act as it stood the Government could only communicate with the temporal Sovereign of the Roman States, in which capacity the Pope had no more to do with the Romish hierarchy of this country than the Grand Duke of Tuscany. The present Ministry accepted that amended bill, and the Pope was thus left to infer the British Government neither desired nor required official communication with him upon the affairs of his hierarchy in this country. Under these circumstances the Pope showed to Lord Minto, not officially, but *officieusement*, as the French said, the Papal brief. An unofficial diplomatist was unofficially shown an unofficial paper, and what more could the British Government from the diplomatic relations that existed between the two States? He did not blame her Majesty's Government for the inoperative nature of the measure, for a really operative measure would have caused a rebellion in Ireland. He was therefore glad the noble lord had sunk his own consistency in preserving the good order of the empire.

Colonel THOMPSON would refuse to interfere in any quarrel with English or Irish Catholics, but he must maintain there had been an aggression. The way not to see it was not to look for it in the right place, and to look somewhere else for it. But there was plenty of it here. When the French General had brought back the Pope to Rome over the bodies of his subjects, a message was brought to this country from Rome, in which might be traced the memory of Waterloo, and which, with an amiable consistency, and in strict accordance with the custom of

States between whom friendly relations existed, contained an allusion to the exiled family of James II. Now, he did not know whether hon. members were aware that a representative of this family was at present living in America. He very often corresponded with him (Colonel Thompson) and he had some notion that this person also corresponded with other members of that house. He (Colonel Thompson) had twice handed over his manifestoes to the Government, so that he could not be charged with misprision of treason. He, at all events, believed in the existence of a man who was the representative of what was generally believed to be the obsolete dynasty of the Stuarts. Then, again, if the Pope had chosen a member of some aristocratic English family for the dignity of cardinal the case would have been somewhat different, but he had selected a person of Spanish birth for this dignity. Such things were not politic or wise, and they were not anything if they were not aggressive and haughty. He believed the language of *L'Univers* had been, not, as was represented, that the time had come for restoring Catholicity in England, but that the time had come for putting down Protestantism by force of arms. Was that a friendly interlocution on the part of the French Catholics? He had heard during this debate eight distinct allusions to a body of men with whom he had hereditary connexions of which he was proud. It was said that the Wesleyan Methodists had an organisation somewhat resembling that of the Catholics. No doubt they had, and a great deal more. They possessed societies, and districts, and superintendents in France; and, if they went to France, and proclaimed there that France was, and always would be, a dependency of England—if, at every opportunity, they advanced the old claim of England to govern that country—would they have a right to complain if they found that the French Government did not regard them with a favourable eye? He (Colonel Thompson) had asked the French Consul how the Methodists behaved in that country? He replied that they were the best subjects that France had; that other sects were always quarrelling, but that the Methodists never quarrelled with anybody. If the Catholics had been guided by the same wisdom, they might have done everything they could reasonably have desired in this country, because it was owing to the decided offence given to England by the See of Rome that all this evil and mischief had arisen. He confessed he should have been glad if the noble lord at the head of the Government had proceeded further than he had gone in his bill. What should we do if the French General at Rome, or the Austrian General at Hamburgh, should move the Pontiff to issue a bull forbidding Roman Catholics to enlist in an army, and directing them to leave the English colours? How must such a bull be met? Was there any provision made by the present bill for such a possible contingency? He should have recognised much more prudence in supplying the 5th and 13th of Elizabeth with reasonable penalties, such as he had no doubt the penalties of this bill would be. He should always be (as he had ever been) ready to insure to his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects the blessings of religious liberty, but he should give his support to the present bill.

Mr. HUME was surprised beyond measure to find his hon. friend, whom he had always regarded as one of the strongest advocates of civil and religious liberty, arguing that an aggression had been made by the Catholic Church against this country, and declaring his wish to see the penalties of the bill followed up by additional enactments. His hon. friend had given no reason for his supporting this bill, which was a measure of persecution, word it as they might. Every rag and remnant of penal enactments against religion that was left in our statute-book was a disgrace to the age, and he should be glad to see them all swept away. He wished the bill had been laid upon the table without a word of debate, so that the House might at once have seen it. They had heard from the Attorney-General a statement very different from that made by the noble lord, so that he could not reconcile the two, and he had no doubt that the bill, when it was brought in, would prove to be a different bill from that which would have been laid upon the table if the House had agreed to the noble lord's motion without opposition. Probably it would undergo some further alteration and amendment if the debate were adjourned, so that the House were discussing a measure without knowing what would be proposed to them. He was disappointed in the measure, which was an act of retrograde persecution. The people of England were calling out against the weight of taxation, but what prospect was there of attaining any reduction, or of pacifying Ireland, if the Government proposed to kindle the flames of religious bigotry? What hope was there of peace, with one-third of our population Catholics, and opposed to this measure? He remembered the time when there were only 8,000 troops in Ireland. Now there were 45,000, and they must send 45,000 more if hon. gentlemen hounded on her Majesty's Ministers to persecute the religion of the sister country. Last night the hon. member (Mr. Disraeli) complained of the burden of taxation upon the agricultural interests. But how could he expect to obtain any relief from the pressure of our enormous establishments if he gave his sanction to such a measure as the present? Instead of removing the Established Church in Ireland, a new element of persecution was raised by her Majesty's Government; and insult was to be added to injustice. The noble lord in his letter had blamed the practices of a party in his own Church for much of what had happened. Why, then, did he not attempt first to put his own Church in order? Why did he not appoint a commission to ascertain which of the clergy of the Established Church had led their flocks to the "verge of the precipice?" The principles of Popery were taught in our universities, and, if the noble lord could not put these offenders down, was it fair to allow him to bring in a persecuting measure against those who had been too long persecuted? Could any man for a moment think that when we had such an establishment of bishops, deans, and functionaries of all kinds, both in England and Ireland, for instructing the

people in their religious duties, there could be any danger from the Catholic priests? Those priests were, indeed, zealous in their duties, while the Church of England did not perform that duty which was expected from her. He was astonished at the course the noble lord had taken, and he protested against this measure of aggression upon the civil liberties of his fellow-countrymen. He wanted free-trade in religion, and let him who had the best defend it. It gave him pain to see a system about to be commenced so contrary to what they had seen for the last twenty-five years, and more especially that the noble lord should have been the man to introduce this measure. But the noble lord was so determined upon carrying it, right or wrong, in violation of the religious feelings of the people of Ireland, that he had said he would not proceed with the financial statement or any business until the debate closed. He (Mr. Hume) wished to see the measure of the Government on the table. He rose principally, however, to express his surprise at the opinions stated by his hon. and gallant friend, and to say that if they wished to drive the Catholic priest out of the Protestant fold they must first drive out the wolves that were in their own. Let the noble lord reform the rubric, and remove from it everything that could give a countenance to Mr. Bennett and his party. With these observations, and protesting against the measure, he would conclude.

Mr. OSWALD said, that it had been stated that from one end of Great Britain to the other there was an unanimous feeling on this subject. Now, he represented the county of Ayr—the stronghold of the Covenanters; and yet in that county there had been no public meeting held—not a single syllable uttered to encourage the noble lord in this crusade against the religious liberties of one third of the people of the United Kingdom. The sword had been drawn—he grieved, as a member of the Church of England, to say it—by James I., Charles I., and Charles II., to support in Scotland that communion to which he belonged, but to which the people of Scotland never belonged; but it had utterly failed; and they might be sure that the noble lord, who had renounced—he doubted not from the purest motives—every principle of his life, would find that he would receive no support at all on this measure. He (Mr. Oswald) believed that the object of the Pope was purely a spiritual object. What other could it be, introduced, as it was, by no temporal sword—by nothing but the allegiance of the faith of those who chose to bow before the Papal throne, and those whom the Pope might appoint? He would not enter into the nice logical distinctions which divided ecclesiastical from spiritual jurisdiction; those he would leave to be discussed by lawyers; but he was a Scotchman, and what had he seen in 1843?—153 members of the General Assembly marching out one by one—a nobler spectacle Christendom had never seen—300 joined them; they constituted themselves on the instant the Free Church of Scotland, and he confessed that he felt the most profound respect for their proceeding. But they did not divide Scotland—they took the districts of Scotland as they existed; they took the presbyteries, the synods, the parishes; and in 600 of those parishes—there were but 900 in the whole of Scotland—they established ministers with manses, churches, and kirk-sessions, having spiritual dominion over every person in the parish; they met in General Assembly; they deliberately called themselves the Free Church of Scotland. Would any Scotch member rise in that House and tell him that the spiritual power of the Pope, who by accident was a foreigner, but who might be a British subject, living in a little house in Golden-square, was exerted one whit more than the spiritual power of that Church to which his right hon. friend the Secretary-at-War belonged? Now, this bill would, as the hon. and learned Attorney-General said, either prevent the synodical action of the Roman Catholic Church, or it would not. He presumed the hon. and learned gentleman knew the meaning of the bill he had drawn, and he had said that it would prevent the synodical action of the Church. Were they going to prevent the synodical action, or rather the provincial action, of the Free Church of Scotland? Was it fair to act so towards the one, and not so towards the other? He could not see how, but he supposed his right hon. friend the Secretary-at-War would clear up the difficulty. But, suppose it did not prevent the synodical action of the Roman Catholic Church, and did nothing but take away titles—how was even that to be done? By preventing persons assuming those titles from receiving charitable bequests. Was that all? It was a dispute about a name. He had been told that Cardinal Wiseman had never yet signed his name as Archbishop of Westminster since this noise began; and he never would, and would snap his fingers in their faces at what they had done. But if the effect of the bill was only to prevent Cardinal Wiseman from signing his name as Archbishop of Westminster, then the noble lord, having received the cordial support of the hon. member for the University of Oxford, and having received the thanks of the hon. member for Warwickshire for his tergiversation and complete abandonment of his former principles, had better do what he advised the Cardinal to do—walk away. There were plenty of men on that (the Opposition) side of the House quite able to go over and discharge its functions. And he (Mr. Oswald) was remarkably glad to hear the speech of his hon. friend below him on the previous evening, for it was an indication that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House were not so entirely divided as they were; and he could not think that the noble lord would have taken this step if he had not thought they were irretrievably divided. They had all sworn to the supremacy of the Queen over the Church, and he supposed they all knew what they had individually meant; but the supremacy of the Crown in Scotland was exercised in the manner in which the noble lord now intended to carry it out here, and the consequence had been 200 years of civil war under the succeeding monarchs of the House of Stuart. Those monarchs understood the supremacy of the Crown as the noble lord understood it. The Free Church had formally opposed it, and lost the whole of their lands and houses because they

would not submit to what they conceived to be an arbitrary act of that supremacy. He therefore should be excessively surprised if his right hon. friend the Secretary-at-War should join in this futile and ridiculous attempt to put down what they could not prevent.

Lord J. RUSSELL then spoke as follows:—With respect to the question put by my hon. friend the member for Montrose, I can only repeat to him again, that, according to the public law of Europe, it is not lawful to erect an ecclesiastical diocese and see in any country without the consent of the Sovereign. That has been repeatedly stated, and I have not heard it contradicted by any person who has opposed this measure; but, secondly, it is quite clear from all inquiries we have made, that there is no Sovereign in Europe who would submit to the creation of bishoprics in his territory unless his consent was obtained. Then, I say, what has been done by the Pope in this country is contrary to the well known public law of Europe, and would not have been done with regard to any other country. With respect to the arguments that have been used against any measure whatever upon this subject, after what has been said by others—after the able arguments that have been addressed to the House, I shall not think it necessary to enter further; but there has been an argument raised, particularly by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, and enforced by the hon. and learned member for Athlone, with respect to the former conduct of the Government on this subject. Now, that argument is directed to two points—one is to the exclusive conduct of the Government of Rome, in previously supposing that this measure would be consented to—the other is the argument against the consistency of the Government, and particularly of myself. As to the first, I beg to recall to the recollection of the House that, after all I stated in 1844 and 1845, after all that may have passed at Rome during Lord Minto's mission there—some three months after Lord Minto left Rome I declared in this House that I had not given my consent, nor would I give my consent, to the erection of sees and dioceses in this country. Therefore, whatever misapprehension may have been entertained at any previous time, this declaration, which must have been well known to the Roman Catholics in this country, and soon afterwards to the authorities of Rome, who were advised from this country, must have precluded all belief on their part that the English Government would be a consenting, or had been a consenting, party to such a proceeding. Therefore I think all that has been originally stated is confirmed, that this act was done in opposition to the Government of this country, in opposition to the Crown of this country, and that its effect purporting to be to erect those sees, with powers of government—not in Edinburgh or Ayrshire, but in Westminster and Middlesex—the people of Westminster and Middlesex naturally thought that nobody ought to govern those English territories but the person who was the lawful Sovereign of the realm; and besides, it has been stated, and the hon. member for Mayo, who is a great opponent of this measure, admitted, that the effect of it was not only to erect those bishoprics and archbishoprics, but to put an end to and abolish the Archbishopric of Canterbury and the Bishopric of London, as they have heretofore existed. If that were the case, and that were the pretension and assumption, I am at a loss to conceive how, in what has been done, there can be nothing in the case—nothing insulting, nothing interfering with the dignity of the Crown and the independence of the nation. But the next point is what the hon. member for Athlone and the hon. member for Buckinghamshire said, that it is totally inconsistent on my part to propose this measure after the declarations I made on former occasions. I am not about to say that those declarations amounted to this—that I thought it was puerile and childish to prevent the assumption of the titles held by the bishops of our Church by the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church; I am not about to say that those opinions of mine are consistent with the opinions I now hold; but I think I am justified in saying this—that whatever may have been my confidence with respect to the conduct of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, or with respect to the conduct of the Pope, I have found since that time that that confidence was misplaced, and I have thought it better clearly and plainly to avow that I was mistaken in the opinion I had formed, and that events had convinced me that I had trusted too much to their forbearance and respect for the sovereign power of this country; and therefore, seeing that that confidence was misplaced, I must take measures in accordance with the events that had occurred. Then the hon. and learned member for Athlone said the reason was that those opinions were given by me out of office, but that in office, in 1849, seeing there was no wish further to consult and conciliate public opinion in Ireland, I came to a different conclusion. It does so happen that in 1846, after I came into office, in moving the Religious Opinions Bill, I said—I am not prepared to say it now—that I thought the admission of all bulls might be permitted, because I did not think any bull would be introduced at variance with the rights of the Crown, or that Roman Catholics would obey them if introduced; but, I think that from hon. gentlemen who sit in this House as Roman Catholics, and take the Roman Catholic oath, I am entitled to some indulgence and credit for the motives by which I have been actuated with respect to the privileges of the Roman Catholic Church; for it did so happen that for 14 years that I sat in this House, whenever I did give a vote, I gave it for the admission of Roman Catholics to seats in this House; and I did so, as I have felt since, at the expense of the confidence of two popular constituencies—I did so against the opinion of the Prince then on the throne—I did so against the opinion, as I believe, of the great majority of the people—I did so, following a man of immortal honour—following Henry Grattan, when the name of Henry Grattan betokened great eloquence and great public service. In that conduct I went on until, in 1829, Sir R. Peel introduced a bill for the admission of Roman Catholics to this House, and on the second reading of that bill he said, with a candour and manliness which did him the highest honour, that the measure was due to the exertions of Mr. Fox—to the exertions of Mr. Grattan—to the

exertions of Plunkett, to the exertions of those who sat opposite to him, by whom the measure had been carried, and by whom his opposition had been defeated. I was one of those who then sat opposite to him, and who, as I have said, had constantly voted in favour of the Roman Catholics. But at a subsequent period, when Sir R. Peel introduced an act for the endowment of Maynooth, gentlemen will recollect there was great popular feeling in this country, and there were hardly any of us who then sat on the Opposition benches who did not receive a letter from some constituents, saying that our seats were in peril and that we never should be elected again if we voted for that bill. With very few exceptions we supported that bill, and in a great measure were the means of carrying that bill in this House. I will not go on with other instances; but I think the conduct of my public life has been such that it is not becoming for a Roman Catholic to rise in this House and say that what I did in 1844 and in 1845 was merely done to conciliate popular opinion in Ireland. I wish as much as possible that Roman Catholics should have the full enjoyment of religious and of political and civil liberties. I do not think that I shall ever be induced to introduce a measure by which they would be prohibited from following their own modes of worship according to their own belief, or by which they would be prevented in consequence of that belief from having any of the honours of the State. But, when this is done, I will not be frightened by the word "persecution" from asserting the due authority of the Crown and the independence of the country. I do not think we ought to submit to this, which I must again repeat is an insult to this country. I think, at all events, we should have a Parliamentary declaration which would free us from the stigma and shame of having submitted to have our country parcelled out as if it were a conquered and submissive country. I think we may do so without infringing in the least degree on the religious liberties of the Roman Catholics. I am sure that, if in the discussion of this bill it can be shown in any way that that religious liberty is infringed upon, I shall be ready to discuss the point and to remove any words with which the worship of Roman Catholics would be interfered with; but, as has been said by a noble lord, if the Holy See, as I am desired to call it, had been pleased in proposing to create bishoprics to make bishoprics over Catholics in communion with the Church of Rome—if the spiritual authority had been confined to Roman Catholics, as the authority of the Free Church is confined to those who belong to the Free Church—if such had been the case, I do not think we should have any reason to complain; but we do complain when, according to the letter of documents, and the known law of Rome, a pretension is asserted that all baptised persons should submit to the foreign dominion of Rome. I will not intrude further on the time of the House. I trust we shall be allowed to introduce the bill. In a further stage of it I shall be ready to defend it, and if I cannot pretend that the course I am now pursuing is entirely consistent with the declaration I made in 1844 and 1845, I have this strong ground—that new and unexpected circumstances have arisen, and that, in order to meet a new aggression, new means of defence are called for.

Mr. MOORE, in explanation, said he had merely asserted that the Pope had the right to alter Roman Catholic episcopates; but that he never supposed for a moment, nor did any man in that House, that he had the power either to abolish or alter the dioceses that existed in this country.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEBRUARY 14.

CONCLUSION OF DEBATE.

Mr. W. FAGAN resumed the debate on the motion for leave to bring in the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and promised, considering the great length to which the debate had already gone, and how much the subject was exhausted, that he would not press long upon the indulgence of the House. He desired to state in the outset that, true to the political and commercial principles he had always held, he last night supported the Government in the division which then took place. He did so from a strong sense of duty, and because he believed that the course of policy proposed by hon. members on the other side of the House would prove detrimental to the best interests of the country. His constituents were most indignant at the course pursued by Government on the question of religious liberty; but he was confident that they would, notwithstanding, fully appreciate the vote he had last night given, and that his conduct would meet with their most cordial approval. In now addressing the House he wished to recall the Catholic view of the question before it, especially as up to Wednesday last only three Roman Catholics had addressed themselves to the subject. He held that the real question to be discussed was, "Had there or had there not been cause given by the Roman Catholics for the course now adopted by the Government?" Had any cause been given for the insult cast upon that body by any infringement of the prerogatives of the Sovereign, or by any insult offered to her Majesty? He denied that there had. He knew well that the noble lord at the head of the Government, and many others, believed that the doctrines of the Catholic religion tended to confine the intellect and enslave the soul; and well might such an opinion prevail, when it was notorious that for the last 300 years scarcely a literary work had issued from the press that did not teem with the most false and calumnious insinuations against the Roman Catholics. No wonder, therefore, that those prejudices should exist even in the minds of the more liberal and educated classes. But his position on the present occasion was, that there had not been any assumption, territorial aggression, or interference on the part of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. He denied, also, that there had been any ostentation in the manner in which the change in the Catholic hierarchy had been brought about. The apostolic letters of the Pope and

the pastoral letter of Cardinal Wiseman, were never intended to be published, but only to be read to their own flocks. It was the press, and the press alone, which brought forth those documents. Cardinal Wiseman, seeing the excitement that existed in this country, gave directions that no address of his to his own people should be published; but the press was so ravenous on this subject that they actually sent reporters to the place of worship to record the addresses of his Eminence. The noble lord had said, that according to the letter of those documents, it was asserted that all baptised persons must submit to the Church of Rome. Now, the doctrine of the Roman Catholics on that point was, that there was but one baptism, and no matter by whom the ceremony was performed, whether by a layman or a clergyman, and no matter of what religious persuasion, still that individual had received the sacrament of baptism. But the Established Church held that no baptism was good which was not performed within their own Church. The doctrine of the Roman Catholics was therefore the more tolerant of the two. All persons baptised, until they came to the age of reason, namely, seven years, when they were supposed to be able to select their own religion, were considered by the Roman Catholics to be within the fold of that religion, but after that time there was no pretence whatever on the part of the Roman Catholics to exercise any dominion, spiritual or otherwise, over any class of baptised Christians, unless they actually belonged to the Catholic religion. The whole matter, however, turned upon two tenets maintained by Roman Catholics. The first tenet was, that the Pope, as the successor of St. Peter in the see of Rome, was by divine institution the head of the Catholic Church, and as such he had power of episcopal institution, of conferring jurisdiction, of creating sees, and of filling up sees in any part of the world where the necessity of religion demanded that he should interfere. When the noble lord said that in no other country in Europe would the Pope have dared to do what he had attempted in this country, the noble lord laboured under a great misapprehension, and forgot that between those countries to which he alluded and the Holy See there existed concordats, by which the Holy See agreed to give up a certain portion of its rights. Russia, for example, had the power of recommending its bishops, whose recommendation the Holy See attended to. But Russia was a despotic country, and if the Pope did not enter into a concordat with that Power the Roman Catholics would be altogether crushed in that country. It was hardly fair to compare England, where religious liberty was enjoyed, with a despotic country like Russia. The same observations would apply in the case of Prussia, and also in the case of France. Besides, the noble lord should have remembered that in those countries the Roman Catholic Church was endowed. He was glad to hear the noble lord say that he had no intention to enter into a concordat with the See of Rome; but the noble lord altogether ignored the Pope as a spiritual Sovereign, and recognised him only as a temporal Sovereign. If, then, the Pope's spiritual authority were not recognised by this country, how was it possible that he should consult the English Government in regard to the changes which he wished to make? The charge of insult, therefore, for not having consulted the English Government, must be thrown aside altogether. The Roman Catholics knew nothing of a Pope as a temporal Sovereign. They altogether eschewed his jurisdiction in a temporal point of view, and held that it would be much better for their religion if the Pope were never to exercise any temporal authority. Most of the charges brought against the Roman Catholic religion originated in the faults and crimes committed by the Popes, who used their ecclesiastical and spiritual influence to increase their temporal power. He need only refer to the acts of Pope Alexander VI. There was no Roman Catholic who would not admit that such a man was a disgrace to the religion he professed. But, out of the 260 Popes that had reigned, he would defy the most violent enemy of his religion to name more than twenty or thirty that could be charged with not having acted according to the spiritual dictates of their holy office. It had been tauntingly thrown out that the Roman Catholics held a divided allegiance; but they no more did so than the 2,000 clergy of the Established Church, who, with the Bishop of Exeter at their head, denied the spiritual supremacy of the Queen in matters of faith and doctrine. The other tenet upon which this question turned was this:—the Roman Catholics believed that the hierarchy was a divine institution, and that the person holding the see should of necessity have jurisdiction and territorial right. It was an inconsistent thing that the Pope of Rome should be Bishop of England; which, however, he nevertheless was, and the vicars-apostolic were only his agents. This measure, therefore, of the Pope would get rid of that inconsistency. He might be asked, if this were a tenet of the Roman Catholic religion, how came it to pass that it had never been acted upon since the Reformation? All he could say was that, from the very commencement of the Reformation, the Roman Catholics were anxious for the restoration of their hierarchy. Even in the reign of Elizabeth they applied for it. But during that reign 100 priests were hung, drawn, and quartered, because they were found enjoying their religion. Under such a system it would have been utterly useless for the Pope to attempt to introduce a hierarchy. It would only have led to additional persecution. The same system existed under James I. During the reign of Charles I. the Puritans had the ascendancy, so that any attempt to introduce a Roman Catholic hierarchy at that time would have been equally unavailing. In the reign of Charles II. they all knew that prejudices existed in England somewhat similar to what were seen to prevail at the present day. In the reign of James II., when the principle of toleration to Roman Catholics was for the first time admitted, they equally besought the restoration of their hierarchy, but in the subsequent reigns, when their existence was not

recognised by law, and when their numbers were few, it would have been useless to attempt to restore it. In the reign of George III., when the exercise of their religion was allowed by law, the vicars-apostolic did not wish to see the hierarchy restored, because the Roman Catholic body was not rich, and was not very numerous; but now that London contained more Roman Catholics than Rome itself, that they had reached 150,000 in Liverpool and Manchester, and numbered 1,000,000 in all within this kingdom, it was absolutely necessary to change the system and obtain an adequate supply of secular clergy, and they could not obtain that supply without a hierarchy. Under the vicars-apostolic the clergy had no protection, and were removable without cause whenever it might please their superior; and it was on spiritual grounds alone, and to remedy the want which was felt of adequate spiritual provision, that the system which had created all this excitement was set on foot. If, however, canonical rights and action were not given to the clergy, it would have been better not to have introduced the hierarchy; but notwithstanding the threats of the noble lord of ulterior proceedings, he (Mr. Fagan) might state that there was the intention of giving canonical rights to the clergy, and to prevent their removal from those parishes into which the dioceses now formed would be ultimately divided. He asked the noble lord, who had declared he would have had nothing to complain of if the spiritual authority of the hierarchy had been confined to Roman Catholics, to abandon his bill, because that authority was over the Roman Catholics, and none other. The noble lord had no right to speak of the conduct of the spiritual head of 200,000,000 of the human race in such terms as "insolent" and "insidious." He knew that in one part of his letter the noble lord only referred to the distractions which existed in his own Church. For his own part, he thought very lightly of the conversions which were said to have taken place from the Church of England. He was one of those who thought men would remain in the religion in which they were educated, particularly in this country, where they were all taught to believe in the right of private judgment; and if they moved at all here he believed it would be in the very opposite direction to Rome; for, as they had been educated in the right of private judgment, they would soon begin to ask themselves, If we are to have private judgment, what is the use of a Church establishment, and of paying bishops large salaries to teach us? He was surprised, however, the noble lord should have accused the Catholic religion of a tendency to fetter the intellect and enslave the soul. Why, it was the Catholic religion that in the darkest ages had withstood barbarism and tyranny and had achieved liberty; it had rescued the people from the oppression of feudalism, and in this country it had won for them Magna Charta. Mr. Macaulay had admitted those facts. Who first introduced the celebrated saying which was now the great Whig toast and maxim—"The sovereignty of the people?" The maligned society of Jesuits. And who had introduced the doctrine of the divine right of kings? Why the Protestant controversialists who opposed the Jesuits. As to the remarks which had been made respecting the canon law, he would observe that the canon law could not be introduced into any country where it was opposed to the civil municipal law, and the obsolete canons suited to wicked and terrible times had no force or existence at the present moment. The noble lord had dragged Ireland into his bill because, forsooth, an archbishop had not been appointed in the ordinary way, and a synod had been held in Ireland. A synod was part and parcel of the constitution of the Catholic Church, and he could not see why they should not hold national as well as general synods. No one knew what had occurred in that synod except from the address of the bishops, and that address had no force whatever without the sanction of the See of Rome. In fact, it was merely because the bishops found themselves assembled together that the address was agreed to. The noble lord had alluded to the fact that about 14 lines of it were occupied with some remarks on the tenure of land; but was it not natural the bishops should say something on that subject after the sufferings of their flocks for the last four years? The noble lord, again, had referred to their conduct on the education question. Now, he had advocated the Queen's colleges all along, but at the same time he insisted that the bishops had a right to interfere in the question, for education was a part of religion; and last year the noble lord had acted on the principle that it was so. It appeared pretty plain, however, that because the bishops had acted as they were bound to do, the hierarchy of Ireland was to be destroyed, and the episcopacy, in the words of the Attorney-General, to be paralysed. Had the noble lord made up his mind for the consequences? If the Attorney-General's explanation of the bill was right, marriages celebrated by the new bishops would be illegal, and if their ordination was not valid, they would, by law, be merely laymen. Would the noble lord admit them into Parliament? Did he think, however, the Roman Catholics who professed the national religion of Ireland would submit to have their hierarchy destroyed? The noble lord should pay attention to the observation, that when the law of man was opposed to the law of God, we should obey the latter, and not the former. He had declared he would expunge everything in his bill which infringed on religious liberty; but full religious liberty could not exist among the Roman Catholics without their hierarchy, and the Attorney-General had shown that the hierarchy would be destroyed. He warned the noble lord not to light a flame he could not extinguish. He had once sought to place the Church establishment in Ireland on a basis more suited to the wants of the people. He was now in love with that establishment; but he (Mr. Fagan) told the noble lord to beware, lest this act of his should bring about a repetition of the year 1836, when 400,000 men were up in arms against tithes in Ireland; and though that impost was now made a charge on the landlord the people might renew their hostility to it. He had given the noble lord his support whenever he could conscientiously do so. He had last evening voted for him, though he knew full

well that, in consequence of the strong indignation which existed against the noble lord he (Mr. Fagan) ran the risk of having that vote misrepresented, and his popularity diminished. But though he had so voted last night, there might from the other side, where the words "Up, guards, and at them," had already been uttered, be promulgated in a few days some proposition which hon. gentlemen on his (Mr. Fagan's) side of the House could conscientiously support, and then, if the noble lord persisted in his course of oppression, he would see them arrayed against him. He (Mr. Fagan) would never do evil that good might come: but if he could conscientiously refuse his support to Government, he certainly would vote against them.

Several hon. members rose to address, but the Speaker called on

Mr. F. PEEL, who said he entirely concurred in the sentiments which had been more than once expressed in the course of this discussion, in which they had been now engaged for three days, that the debate was somewhat premature, somewhat vague and discursive in the range of its topics, and that it would have been carried on with greater advantage if they had first waited till they had been able to ascertain in all its bearings and in all its details the measure propounded by the noble lord, and which he had moved for leave to introduce. And in the observations which he would venture, with the permission of the House, to make, it was not his intention to anticipate the line of conduct which he would take with respect to this bill in the further stages of its progress through the House, ignorant, as he was, of the particular nature of the provisions of the bill and of the extent to which they were likely to be carried into execution. But there were some points connected with that subject which were, he thought, unconnected with the particular manner in which the bill might be framed, and to which he was desirous of confining his observations as well as he could. Now, the bill had had, as the noble lord anticipated, the ill luck of satisfying neither side of the House; at least, as far as the lower portion of the House was concerned. Hon. gentlemen on that (the Government) side of the House considered the provisions of the bill went beyond the necessity and emergency of the occasion. Hon. gentlemen on his side of the House considered that they did not come up to the emergency. Now, he had no intention to make any observations in reference to the course taken by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, but hon. gentlemen on his side of the House had in the course of their speeches contrasted the measure of the noble lord with the speech in which he had vindicated the measure in the same indignant spirit as that which had obviously dictated the letter to the Bishop of Durham. They thanked him for his speech, they thanked him for his letter, but his bill, if they accepted it at all, they accepted only as an instalment of what was due to them. Now, he was not surprised that hon. gentlemen who had at the numerous meetings throughout the country argued this question with so much warmth during the recess as an attack on our liberties, as an assault on the supremacy and prerogatives of the Crown, as an insult to the Church of England and to her bishops, should feel some little disappointment when they found that a question which they had argued on so extended a basis should be reduced into the narrow dimensions of a bill for the purpose of extending and enlarging the provisions of the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829. But he protested against this question being argued as if it had been prejudged by the sense of the country, however united the voice of that country might have been. He thought their functions there were something more than simply to endorse the opinions pronounced by the country. They were bound to discuss that question for themselves; and the question which they had, as he conceived, to consider was, whether the provocation which had been given by the Court of Rome—and he would not deny there had been provocation—nay, more, he condemned as much as any man could do the un-Christian, uncharitable spirit, the arrogant and haughty tone which pervaded every line of the pastoral letter and of the address—but the question was, as it appeared to him to be, whether that provocation did justify the interposition of any legislative enactment; and if it did, whether any measure could be framed of a more binding and stringent character than that which the noble lord had announced his intention of introducing, without infringing on that which they all professed themselves, as he believed, sincerely, desirous to maintain inviolate—the sanctity of religious liberty. But while he should be extremely sorry to underrate the importance or significance of those meetings which had taken place in the country, to his mind the real value they possessed was not in the House, taking them as a measure for legislation, but in the circumstance that they had seen a great and overwhelming majority of the people meeting together and placing on record their firm and unshaken attachment to the Protestant religion as by law established. And it was not merely that circumstance, but that they had also seen Protestant Dissenters as well as Protestants of the Church of England, as he believed, under the influence of feelings to which the hon. member for Manchester had adverted when he said that they saw in the proceedings taken by the Court of Rome an indication that opinions were entertained there that the Roman Catholic religion was about to make great and rapid strides in this country. He thought they had met for the purpose, in a time of doubt and of perplexity, of reassuring one another, by joint resolutions, and by declaring their determination to stand by the great principles of the Reformation, with which he thought they now could certify the people considered the cause of truth, of pure religion, and uncorrupt faith indissolubly bound up together. Now, as to the bill of the noble lord, whatever might be its merits, he thought it could not claim the merit of being a permanent and comprehensive settlement of the question. It certainly had not that merit, and the noble lord did not lay claim to it.

* * * *For Conclusion of Debate see next Number, Series XXIII., Now Ready.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

PAPAL AGGRESSION.—HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEB. 14, 1851.

(Conclusion of Debate from the Twenty-second Series.)

Mr. F. PEEL continued to observe—The Attorney-General had told them its only object was to afford a remedy for a specific offence or evil of which he complained, and he said also that he thought in taking that course he was acting on a wise and sound maxim of politics. That course might be a very wise and sound maxim, but, at the same time, he thought it could not be disputed that it would be very desirable the position of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, in its relations to the Government and to the people, should be placed on such a footing as to render it impossible to have any recurrence of the agitation and tumult through which the country had passed. But those who recommended that arrangement had generally some such scheme as that which had been discussed from the time of the Union to the passing of the Relief Act of 1829. He had heard the hon. member for Meath (Mr. Grattan) allude to the bill of 1843, and say that if that measure had received the sanction of the Legislature, it would have avoided many of the heartburnings we have lately experienced. The question was considered at the time of the passing of the Relief Bill of 1829. At that time they were about to deprive the Church of England of those securities—if they were securities—which she had till then enjoyed, in the closing of every avenue to office against the Roman Catholic Church, and they had then to consider if they would substitute any other securities in place of them. Well, he thought they then took a wise and sound course; they were aware that a communication had always been carried on with the Court of Rome, which was, indeed, rendered necessary by the community which existed between the see of Rome and the Catholic Church. They determined to leave it entirely free and uncontrolled, and trusted to the loyalty and good faith of the Catholics, and to the conviction that they would not be made instruments of political intrigue, or interfere with the internal domestic and temporal concerns of the country. And they had dealt in the same way with the hierarchy of that Church. Government said, we have no desire to have any voice in the nomination or selection of the bishops of the Church of Rome. They trusted in the good sense of the Pope, and that he would not select persons who would render themselves, by turbulent and disloyal conduct, distasteful to the people of this country; and he thought the noble lord had pointed out without exception the inconvenience and embarrassment which would have resulted from any harsh course; and he had heard with satisfaction that the noble lord had no intention of interfering with the internal organisation of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, with respect to these considerations, there were two points on which he felt very strongly, and by which he would be in a very great measure actuated in the course he would adopt. The points in question were the position of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, and the constitution of that Church. With respect to the former point, reference might be made to the abstract question of law; but we had seen that not much value was to be attached to the consideration, for Government declined to prosecute under an Act of Parliament, not because there was anything ambiguous, faltering, or hesitating in the language of the Act, but because it had become obsolete, no recent precedents of prosecution having occurred under its provisions. But, setting aside the abstract question of law, it must be admitted that, as the matter now stood, to all intents and purposes, Roman Catholics might, with perfect impunity, recognise the Pope of Rome, and the Pope might exercise in this country spiritual and ecclesiastical authority as far as Roman Catholics were concerned. There were persons, he knew, who thought the adoption of an opinion of this kind hardly consistent with the oath of supremacy taken by Protestant members at the table of that House. For his part, he was able to take that oath with a very clear conscience, and yet maintain this opinion. He would not take refuge in the construction which some put on the form of words contained in that oath, namely, that it amounted only to a declaration that the Pope had no jurisdiction which could be legally enforced. What he conceived the words called upon them in their consciences to affirm was, that the spiritual headship over the Church claimed by the Court of Rome was a claim unsound in sense and Scripture. It happened, however, that a great body of our fellow-subjects held a different opinion. For a long time we prosecuted them for holding that opinion. But times were changed, and Roman Catholics had been admitted to all the privileges of British subjects; but that circumstance would not prevent him from maintaining the doctrine that the Pope had no authority, and ought to have none, within this realm. With respect to the second point, namely, the constitution of the Church of Rome, it appeared that it was essentially an episcopal Church. It was placed entirely under the government of men who claimed a divine mission for their authority. These men composed the hierarchy of the Church of Rome, and if you prevented that Church from

having bishops the hierarchy would be incomplete, and unquestionably the liberty of the Roman Catholic Church would be encroached on. It was admitted that the vicars-apostolic who had governed the Roman Catholic Church in this country for the last 300 years were bishops, and capable of discharging any of the spiritual functions appertaining to the office of a bishop. It was impossible to deny that some ecclesiastical jurisdiction belonged to the Roman Catholic bishops. Every religious society must have some power to administer its ecclesiastical concerns, and we know that for 300 years the ecclesiastical concerns of the Roman Catholic Church in this country had been administered by vicars apostolic under the constitution contained in the brief of Pope Benedict XIV. So that all the change which had taken place recently was the substitution of the code of the Church, the canon law, by the Roman Catholic Church for the temporary government, the vicars-apostolic, under which its affairs had hitherto been administered. If the government by bishops in ordinary was necessary for the administration of the canon law, he could see no just cause of complaint in the Pope constituting the diocesan form of government for the purpose of administering that law. "But," said the noble lord at the head of the Government, "when we examine the act by which the dioceses are formed and episcopal government constituted, we find them utterly inconsistent with the liberties of the country and the rights of the Crown; for what has the Pope done? He, a foreign power, has assumed the privilege of raising certain towns in this country to the rank of cities, of forming sees, and making them the seats of episcopal authority, filling those sees with bishops nominated by himself, and authorising them to assume titles derived from the designation of places where their churches are set up, and conferring upon them ecclesiastical jurisdiction." The noble lord further said that the assumption of the titles thus given—titles conferring rank, dignity, and precedence—was an invasion of the rights of the Sovereign, who was invested by the constitution of the country with the sole prerogative of conferring titles of honour and dignity. The noble lord, however, did not confine his objection to the mere assumption of ecclesiastical titles, i.e. also complained of parcelling out the country into dioceses. Upon this point the noble lord said that the public law of Europe was on his side, and that it prohibited the Pope from creating dioceses in a country without the sanction of the Sovereign of that country. But he (Mr. Peel) was not satisfied upon this point—namely, whether the public law referred to by the noble lord had not grown up to determine the relations between the Court of Rome and those Roman Catholic countries only where that religion was established absolutely, and where the rights of bishops and clergy, and of the clergy and laity respectively, were guaranteed by law. It was obvious that in that case a foreign power could not dispense with the law of a country which had received the sanction of the Government of that country. But see the evil of legislating on this subject. Go a little way, and your act is impotent; go further, and it became a dead letter. The Attorney-General told the House he had good grounds for believing that the bill would prevent synodical action. The hon. and learned gentleman said he made that statement on the authority of an allegation in Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal;" but, if that were the only authority he had for making the statement, it might be doubted whether the resources of the Roman Catholic Church would be so easily exhausted, and whether they would not find some means of evading the provisions of the bill. It was stated that some evil had already been experienced in Ireland, and that similar evil might be expected to result in this country from the introduction of the canon law; and the noble member for Bath dwelt with particular emphasis on the fact that one of the avowed objects of the constitution of the diocesan form of government in this country was the introduction of the code of the Roman Catholic Church—the canon law; and with great research he brought to light a great number of passages from that code—a code, be it recollected, which Lord Stowell, sitting as an ecclesiastical judge in the diocesan court of London, eulogised as a system deeply founded in the wisdom of men. The noble member for Bath cited several passages from the canon law of a very reprehensible and disgusting character, chiefly with the view of showing that the tenor of that law was opposed to the spirit and policy of the civil law. But the real question was, what was the sanction for the canon law in this country? Was submission to the provisions of the canon law merely voluntary? There was a great difference between the canon law and the ecclesiastical law in this country. We had incorporated the ecclesiastical law into our law, and the civil power gave effect and sanction to it. The hon. and learned member for Oxford contrasted the conduct of the Pope in introducing the canon law into this country with the course taken by our consuls in certain districts of Turkey, where they administered foreign law differing from the municipal law of those districts. But what were the conditions under which the consuls administered law in the Levant? In our case the Pope had not received the consent of the Crown by diplomatic arrangement, or in any other way, to the introduction of the code of the Church; but the consular jurisdiction was exercised by the consent of the powers in whose territory the consuls were stationed, and the decision of the consular courts was enforced, if necessary, by the aid of the civil power. [The hon. member read an extract from a treaty between Russia and Denmark in support of this view of the question.] He greatly doubted the policy of protecting the Roman Catholic laity from the provisions of a code to which they paid only a voluntary submission. Reference had been made to the inconvenience experienced from synodical action. We had seen bishops of the Irish Roman Catholic Church meeting together for the purpose of exerting their power to the utmost to frustrate an Act of Parliament which opened to the middle classes of that country an

opportunity which, he trusted, they would not be deterred from availing themselves of, of giving to their children the advantage of a sound education in every branch of literature and science without exposing them to the slightest taint as regards their tenets, morality, or their religious doctrines. He condemned that improper interference, seeing that we had recognised, at last, education as the great moral agent—as the great security for the stability and permanence of our institutions. But, if we wished to oppose the introduction and administration of the canon law—if we thought we could, by the bill about to be introduced, prevent synodical action, he greatly feared we had miscalculated our resources—he greatly doubted whether we should not be found destitute of the ability to carry out what we were desirous to effect, and that, finally, we should regret having furnished another illustration proving how utterly powerless the heavy arm of temporal power was in dealing with the voluntary submission of the mind—of dealing with those questions of imaginary sentiment, as they were called by some one, which resided within the precincts of the conscience. One word on the theological part of the question, for it assumed a twofold aspect, part political and part theological. Unquestionably there had been a virtual denial or non-recognition of the Church of England, and of its claim to be deemed a branch of the great Catholic Church. We had been told that our bishops were no bishops, that our clergy were no clergy, and that our services and sacraments had no more binding force and virtue than mere civil ordinances and regulations of the State. These allegations had doubtless exercised a strong influence on the minds of many persons; but, for his part, he did not desire his view of the question to be influenced by any considerations of that kind. He did not wish to trust to any Act of Parliament for the vindication of the Anglican Church. He relied with great confidence on the power of controversial writings—on the power of appeals to the good sense of the people—on the power which we had of demonstrating that the pretension of the Church of Rome to spiritual headship was not only claimed without warrant in Scripture, but utterly opposed to it. The present time was marked by no feeling of indifference to the Church of England and the extension of her influence. The opinion, perhaps, might not be shared by many, but he was strongly impressed with the conviction that at no period—and this was, in a great measure, owing to the absence of legislative restrictions—was the Church of England, notwithstanding the differences and dissensions prevailing in her bosom—notwithstanding the efforts of those who were labouring to overlay the simplicity of the Common Prayer-book with the ritual and ceremonial observances not in consonance with the spirituality that characterised Protestant worship—notwithstanding the efforts of those who were labouring to give the clergy the character of the intercessorial and mediatorial priesthood which did not belong to them—notwithstanding all these unfavourable circumstances, his conviction was that the Church of England was never more deeply grounded in the affections of the great bulk of the people than at this moment. Looking around him, and observing in every direction the zealous co-operation of the clergy and laity in building endowed schools, erecting churches, and making provision for the spiritual instruction of the people, he could not close his mind against the conviction that the Church of England was well founded in the affections of the English people. Whatever might have been the past condition of the Church, experience had shown that it could maintain its ground without the aid of artificial support—nay, that she could not only maintain her ground, but make way against rival religious denominations by daily drawing within her pale an ever-widening circle of the people of this country. The Church of England had nothing more to fear from the Church of Rome. The basis on which our Church rested—the Scriptures, which every man could read and exercise his judgment in interpreting—rendered her impregnable to the assaults of Rome; and he confessed he saw more evil in abandoning that wise and prudent course of granting full toleration to every denomination of religious associations in this country, which the Church of England, with a true appreciation of her own interest, and with a clear insight into what was conducive to her real interests, had, tardily it might be, but still he hoped heartily, consented to recognise.

Sir J. DUKÉ felt under great disadvantage in addressing the House at all times; and that disadvantage was certainly not lessened on the present occasion by his rising as he did immediately after the hon. and learned gentleman who had just sat down. Indeed, had he consulted merely his own feelings he would gladly have contented himself with giving a silent vote on the present question; but, having the honour to represent an important constituency, which had been referred to by the hon. member for Manchester (Mr. Bright), he felt it necessary to say a few words with which he hoped the House would indulge him. But, before he referred to the observations of the hon. member for Manchester, he begged to say that something like an unfair censure had been cast upon the noble lord at the head of the Government for the letter which he had addressed to the Bishop of Durham. It had been said that that letter had been the means of occasioning the meetings which had taken place in London and throughout the country, and that the noble lord, being in want of "political capital," found it necessary to call upon the people to come forward and resist Papal aggression. It had also been alleged that that letter was published on the day before the 5th of November, in order to excite the City on the occasion of the annual processions. Now, he (Sir J. Duke) happened to be abroad at the time that letter was published, but, on his return, he took the opportunity of going over the public papers to see what course the City of London and the public had taken upon this important question in his absence; and he found that, so early as the 14th of October, nearly the whole of the newspapers of the capital had united in calling upon the public and

the Government to resist the Papal aggression. He found articles to the same effect in those papers on the 21st and 22nd of October. On the 23rd appeared a letter from a gentleman at Exeter, desiring to know whether the noble lord and the Government supported the appointment of Dr. Wiseman. On the 25th the clergy of Westminster met, and addressed the Bishop of London. On the 30th the inhabitants of the important parish of St. George, in the metropolis, met for the same object. On the 31st the London clergy also met, and addressed the bishop. On the 28th a reply appeared to the Exeter letter, from the secretary of the Premier, to the effect that, neither directly or indirectly, had the noble lord sanctioned the appointment of Dr. Wiseman. On the 2nd of November he found that the great parish of Marylebone, in vestry assembled, protested against the Papal aggression. He found also that the parish of Stepney met about the same time, and that similar meetings were held at Gloucester, Canterbury, Dover, Deal, Southampton, Worcester, Reading, and other places—all before the appearance of the noble lord's letter. That letter appeared only on the 7th of November, so that it was an error to say that it was published on the 4th for the purpose of exciting the public on the following day. On the 7th of November took place the meeting of the corporation of London; but he could assure the House that the noble lord's letter had nothing to do with that meeting, which was held on the usual day, and had been summoned a week before. Being a member of that corporation, he was unwilling to say anything about its proceedings, except to remind the House that they had the high honour of approaching the Sovereign on great and important occasions; and, although he had been twenty years connected with the corporation, he never remembered it availing itself of that privilege except in the present instance; and he presumed that nothing but the consideration that it was a case of unusual importance would have induced them to do so. But although he would say nothing more of the proceedings of the corporation, he might be allowed to refer to the great and important meeting of bankers, merchants, and traders of the City of London. Among other meetings which had taken place throughout the country, there was one, he believed, of the enlightened constituents of the hon. member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), who had not only addressed the Queen, but had passed a vote of thanks to the noble lord. Now, those meetings had been described as the result of intolerance, ignorance, and bigotry. He (Sir James Duke) did not know whether that was the case or not; but he believed that if those addresses to the Queen had been petitions to the House of Commons in support of some favourite scheme of free-trade policy, certain hon. members would have talked loudly enough of the dignity of the ancient corporation of London, the great weight of the merchants, bankers, and traders of the first commercial city in the world, and the intelligent and irresistible voice of the country. He did not know what might be the result of this debate; but he was quite certain, that by whatever combination of parties the measure might ultimately be defeated, the feeling of the country would rally round the noble lord and his Government, and, in the language of the magnificent speech with which he had introduced the measure, would show them that they were ready to resist the Papal aggression "in all points and with all their power." With regard to the remarks which the hon. member for Manchester (Mr. Bright) had made respecting the Rev. Dr. Russell, he begged to say that he had known that rev. gentleman for many years, and that a more upright, exemplary, and pious clergyman could not be found in the Church or country; and, when he found his name mentioned as having had recourse to or sanctioned the exactions which had taken place in a meeting-house in his parish, he felt it due to him to him to say, that he had no more to do with that transaction than the hon. member himself; and that the persons who were alone responsible for it were the parochial authorities acting under a warrant from one of the magistrates of the City of London, than whom he would venture to say there was no set of men more kind or considerate in the discharge of such delicate and difficult duties.

Mr. B. WALL said that it ought always to be considered, in dealing with this question, that there were only two ways in which the Pope could act in the case of Protestant States which were foolish enough not to have a concordat with him, viz., either by excommunicating them or by ignoring their existence; and he need not say that the Pope had adopted the most gracious of those two modes of proceeding towards the noble lord. When he listened to the speech of the noble lord on introducing the measure, he was in hopes he would be able to congratulate him, and those who supported him, at least upon this, that it would be the *minimum* interference. After listening to the speech of the Attorney-General, however, he found, to his regret, that it amounted to the *maximum* of persecution. He said advisedly the *maximum* of persecution, because he knew no persecution so grating to individuals as bit by bit persecution, the extent of which they never knew, and which was to be dealt out to them according to the amount of mental reservation which they displayed. If they had much mental reservation they were to have little persecution; but, if they were bold, honest, true, and faithful Catholics, the persecution was to be proportionately increased. He called the bill of the noble lord an aggressive measure, because, without saying who threw the first stone, it was the first Parliamentary measure of aggression that had been introduced since 1829. It was hostile to all the noble lord's previous declarations; and he must say, that if the noble lord had changed his opinions, as he had, of course, a perfect right to do, he was, at any rate, bound to acquaint those who were in the habit of supporting him with the change which was gradually taking place in his own mind; and he would go further, and say that he was above all, bound to tell his friend and ally the Pope, with whom he had formerly been

in such habits of intimacy and confidence. It appeared to him that the conduct of the Pope in this case was exceedingly natural. He could imagine his Holiness sitting in an arm-chair in the Vatican, with every enjoyment about him except that of seeing the *Times* newspaper daily, a misfortune which, of course, he brought upon himself—he could imagine the Pope sitting there, and saying to himself, “I look back into the history of the Irish Church, and I find that there has been an uninterrupted succession of Irish Catholic bishops. I find from the pages of *Hansard* (for the Pope would doubtless have *Hansard*, though he had not the *Times* newspaper)—I know that my bishops in Ireland have always been treated with great deference and respect by the English Government. I know that titles are given them, that the *entrée* of the Court is allowed them, and that everything they ask is bestowed upon them. I find that the Queen’s prerogative extends alike to England and Ireland, and I cannot conceive that it would be a greater insult to the Queen that I should have bishops in England than that I should have bishops in Ireland. I don’t expect, of course, my former friend and confidant to say that he entirely approves my appointment of bishops and archbishops in England, but I know what his leanings are, and what his Government have uniformly done, and I don’t anticipate any difficulty. I shall therefore issue my brief on the subject.” He (Mr. Wall) thought such would naturally be the feelings of the Pope; and he did not see how the noble lord could well be surprised at what had occurred. It had, perhaps, not been so much noticed as it deserved, that notwithstanding the prevalence of practices in religious worship which were supposed to have a tendency to Romanism, not one Scotch Presbyterian had quitted the faith in which he was educated—a fact that appeared to him rather curious. In the next remark which he was about to make, he felt that he should not carry with him the assent of the Prime Minister; but, with great deference to that noble lord, he could not help saying that in religious matters ultramontane opinions had been usually met, and must in general be encountered, by opinions of a more moderate character, and if the noble lord needed any instances to convince him of that truth he need only look through the debates of the last ten years. Now, what were the reasons which the noble lord gave for bringing forward such a bill as was then before the House? Among those reasons he found the wishes of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the appointment of Dr. Cullen to the Roman Catholic Primacy of Ireland, the meetings and decisions of the Synod of Thurles; and because that body took into its consideration the occupation of land in Ireland, such a fact was made one of the grounds for introducing the measure now under consideration. But, surely, that did not form a sufficient reason for altering the political principles which the noble lord had hitherto professed. In his opinion, the effect of such legislation would be to make every Roman Catholic a Jesuit and every priest a spy. It was said that in the bill of 1829 it was proposed to insert a clause very similar in effect to that which was now sought to be accomplished by the bill of the noble lord; but that proposition was not then successful, and it was not immaterial to observe that the noble lord opposed it. The wish, he believed, of the noble lord once had been to govern without the aid of bills of pains and penalties; but he regretted to observe that the noble lord was now apparently giving up that principle. With regard to the present measure, he should say, before he sat down, that if the bill were to become the law of the land it should be sifted most carefully; but, whatever care might be bestowed on it, he did not hesitate to express his belief that in Ireland great difficulty would be found in carrying it into execution. The Irish members of the House did not support the views taken by the noble lord, and, if he did not carry the measure with unanimity, it was to be feared that its operation in Ireland would prove unsuccessful. In his opinion, it was a bill that would redound neither to the safety of the State nor the peace of the country.

MR. G. A. HAMILTON said, that as other hon. members had been allowed to introduce irrelevant matter, he perhaps might be permitted to notice one or two topics which did not very strictly come within the scope of the debate. His hon. and learned friend and colleague was accused of having altered his sentiments, which was quite a mistake, for the opinions which he held antecedent to the year 1829 were opinions that he still retained. His hon. and learned friend and colleague had always said that he regarded the question which Parliament dealt with in 1829 as a settled question, but the hon. member for Athlone seemed to deny that, and brought forward as an accusation against his hon. friend the alleged fact that he had been the secretary to one of the Brunswick Clubs, which were organised for the purpose of resisting the law in case the Roman Catholics were to be emancipated. With reference to this, he wished to say that his hon. friend had no recollection of having filled any such office. [Mr. Keogh inquired if the hon. and learned gentleman denied having been secretary to a Brunswick club?] The club in which he held the office of secretary was not established with the avowed purpose of resisting the law under any circumstances. The members of that club were men of the highest rank in society, and of the most undoubted loyalty. The association to which his hon. and learned friend was secretary was a society established in 1832, the objects of which were to develop the resources of Ireland and to ameliorate the condition of the people. The other mis-statement made by the hon. member for Athlone had reference rather to the University of Dublin than to the members who represented it in that house. In reply to that, he should say it was quite a mistake to suppose that there were no honours or emoluments in Trinity College open to Roman Catholics. There were honours, the money value of which did not amount to less than 6,940*l.*, open alike to Protestants and Catholics; and, excluding the Professorship of Divinity, excluding the fellowship and others on the foundation, the pecuniary advantages

open exclusively to Protestants did not amount to more than 4,752*l*. It was said that the junior fellows enjoyed enormous incomes. A stipend of 40*l*. Irish was all that the junior fellows received out of the funds of the University. It was true that the 28 junior fellows had among them the education of the 1,500 students, but the number of pupils that any of the junior fellows had greatly depended upon their own reputation and influence. Then with respect to the manner in which Government patronage was dispensed in Ireland, he could not help noticing the fact that Mr. Henn and Mr. Bennett were passed over, whereas, if they were Roman Catholics, they would probably now have been on the bench. There was another misstatement which he wished to correct; it was this—that Sir E. Sugden, when Chancellor of Ireland, had distinctly recognised Dr. Crolly as Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. It was not so. Reports made up in the masters' offices in Chancery were not made known to the Chancellor in all their details; the important, or disputed parts, were brought under his notice, but it was not usual for him to make himself acquainted with their entire contents; therefore Sir E. Sugden could not be said to have given his sanction to any such assumption of title. But now, passing from these topics, he would ask, had the Government laid sufficient ground for the measure that had been introduced. It did appear to him most conclusively that the act of the Pope was a violation of the law of Europe; it violated the spirit if not the letter of the law of England. A great indignity was therefore offered to the regality of the Queen. That being his opinion he thought it right that the largest possible ground should have been laid for the introduction of the bill, and this was all that he should for the present say, for he had no wish to discuss the details of the measure till the bill was laid on the table of the House. He should only add that the noble lord and his party had effected great changes, and removed many restrictions, and in doing so they conceived that they were advancing the cause of civil and religious liberty; but perhaps it would be found that, yielding as they had done to the demands of the Roman Catholics, they were by no means promoting the cause of civil and religious liberty.

Mr. SADLEIR observed that the statement respecting the secretaryship of the hon. member opposite had last year been made by himself, and this year reiterated by the hon. member for Athlone. The hon. and learned member said he had no recollection of the circumstance; but he (Mr. Sadleir) challenged him to deny the fact, and the hon. and learned member, he observed, was silent. Would the hon. and learned member deny that he was a member, if not secretary, of a Brunswick club within the precincts of the University of Dublin, and that he spoke in that club? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hamilton) denied that these were illegal associations. But he would assert that Brunswick clubs were regarded by every statesman of the time as illegal associations, and as subjecting their members to the pains and penalties of the law. Before he proceeded to examine whether the spirit of the Emancipation Act had been carried out by the Whigs during the seventeen years in which they had been in office, let him express his gratification that the author of that act had left us a living pledge and a positive security in the hon. member for Leominster that the principle of that great act would not be reversed, and he could not but congratulate the people of this country that the late Sir R. Peel had left behind him a son so worthy of his renown and of the statesmanlike career of one whose loss he feared the House would long have to deplore. The noble lord (J. Russell) the other night asserted that since the act of 1829 the larger portion of the public patronage of the State in Ireland had been conferred upon persons professing the Roman Catholic faith. An hon. gentleman on the Treasury bench shook his head, but he had with him the passage of the noble lord's speech in the *Times* newspaper, which he would read, if his accuracy were questioned. Now, the noble lord was incapable of manufacturing a fact, and he must, therefore, have been made the instrument of some party who had designedly advanced one of the most palpable mis-statements that he (Mr. Sadleir) had heard expressed during the present session of Parliament, even from the Treasury bench. He asserted, on the contrary, that the heads of every public department in Ireland were Protestants. In every department of the public service an undue proportion of officials was taken from gentlemen professing the Protestant religion. He challenged contradiction to this statement. Irishmen without distinction or creed had indeed been excluded from their fair participation in offices connected with the public service in this country. To begin with the Cabinet. Ever since the passing of the act of 1829 every Roman Catholic had been systematically excluded from the Cabinet, and in this instance, to begin with, the Whigs had failed in carrying out the spirit of the Emancipation Act. In the colonies Irishmen were denied their fair share of public patronage. No office in the colonies was considered safe in the hands of an Irishman, unless it might be some post within one degree of the lowest. He had before adverted to the patronage of our Indian empire, and contended that it was not so dispensed as to do justice to Ireland. The noble lord, in his speech the other night, said that out of three Chief Justices in Ireland two were Roman Catholics and one Protestant; and he left the House to conclude that, therefore, the Catholics had obtained promotion upon the judicial bench in the proportion of three to two. Now, a few facts would show how unfounded was any such inference. The office of Lord Chancellor had been five times vacant since the act of 1829, yet it could only be filled by a Protestant. Only one Roman Catholic Master in Chancery had been appointed since 1829. Out of twelve common law judges five were Roman Catholics. There were seven judges in the Court of Chancery, in the receipt of 25,000*l*. a-year, and only one Roman Catholic could be found in that body, who got 2,767*l*. In the Queen's Bench the judges were all Protestants, yet in that

court there had been five vacancies since 1829. The two Remembrancers were Protestants; the two Bankrupt Commissioners were Protestants. Of the five Taxing Masters only one was a Roman Catholic. The three Encumbered Estates Commissioners were all Protestants. If he looked to the Chancery official staff he found seventy-three officers, whose emoluments were 60,000*l.* a-year; sixteen of these were Roman Catholics, who received not quite 3,000*l.* a-y ar. There were twenty-two officers of the staff of the Law Exchequer, who received at least 10,000*l.* a-year, who were all Protestants. The assistant-barristers were thirty-two in number, who received, exclusive of fees, 15,000*l.* a-year. Eight of this body were Roman Catholics, taking 3,732*l.* a-year. The twelve judges in the Common Law Courts received altogether 47,524*l.*, of whom three were Roman Catholics. Of the eighty-two officers of those courts, receiving 23,951*l.*, seventeen were Roman Catholics, receiving among them less than 3,800*l.* a year. And this was his answer to the noble lord. There were eighty-two officers connected with the common law courts receiving 23,923*l.* a year, but seventeen of them only were Roman Catholics, and of that amount they received only 3,800*l.* Happily, they had in Ireland a Viceroy who had taken every opportunity of proclaiming that he would dispense the public patronage pertaining to his office so as to carry out the principles enunciated by the hon. member for the University of Dublin, by promoting those who were entitled to distinction and promotion on account of their professional merit. Now, if the Irish bar, knowing that those were the principles of the Viceroy, found members of that bar, without any professional standing or any character for legal erudition, advanced to judicial offices in Ireland, they felt that there was a twofold injury inflicted on them, because they considered it was a practical condemnation of their claims to the confidence and respect of their countrymen. It was that feeling that had irritated members of the Irish bar as to the distribution of public patronage, and he could not help saying that the promotion to the office of assistant-barrister in Ireland of some gentlemen was a disgrace to the Government, and an act which the Irish bar justly resented. The noble lord should recollect, too, that, while they had the important office of legal adviser to the Lord-Lieutenant filled by a gentleman professing the Protestant religion, the Catholics and Irishmen had a just cause to complain. He been led to make these remarks by the observations of the noble lord on a former evening. But now with reference to the bill the noble lord sought to introduce, and the necessity for it. The noble lord had entertained the House, in the course of the three speeches he had made on this subject, with a review of ecclesiastical history, and had endeavoured to raise an analogy between the condition and circumstances of another country, and this calculated to enlighten them in the dilemma into which they had been brought. But the noble lord might have told them that in former times, even in Ireland, the usual mode of appointing a bishop was by the dean and chapter of the diocese, with the consent of the King and the concurrence of the Pope; and that was a very natural arrangement, looking at the circumstances of the time. It was a wise and natural arrangement, for instance, in the case of the archdiocese of Cashel, when, in former times, the same individual combined in his own person the office of king and archbishop of the diocese. As to the cry of "No Popery" that had been raised in this country, for it was nothing less, he would remind English gentlemen that there was no subject upon which it was so easy to excite the religious feelings and prejudices of the people as that cry, and those who had devoted their wealth and ability to hound on the people in that senseless cry ought to recollect how actively the agents of infidelity might mark, in our wretched dissensions, the weakness of Christianity, and the opportunities those dissensions gave them of disseminating the poison of their own principles. The greatest Protestants in this country had constantly declared in their writings and speeches that the principles of Protestantism stood upon a firmer basis than the fragile aid that could be derived from statutory enactments; and to his Catholic fellow-subjects he would say that, at this juncture, it behoved them to be vigilant and firm. He felt a natural and honest pride in belonging to a body so loyal and faithful, notwithstanding the slanders that had been vented against the practices and doctrines of their religion—he felt an honest pride in belonging to a body who had always been distinguished by their allegiance to their Sovereign. As to the charges of the press, his answer was the declaration of a Protestant divine, who had justly paid the tribute that was due to all that was admirable and valuable in the faith he (Mr. Sadleir) professed. One of the most distinguished divines of the Protestant Church had borne testimony to the fact, that the missionaries of the Catholic Church were to be found in every clime scaling the ramparts of infidelity, and planting on its highest citadel the triumphant banners of their faith. The Catholics had won their present position by the dignified and honourable course of constitutional exertions. It was not to the noble lord, or the isolated efforts of any individual, that they owed the legislative advantages they had won. They had subdued and overcome the spirit of religious interference by controlling their own passions: and by their dignified resignation, by their firm fortitude under years of persecution and oppression, guided by the energies, the unrelaxing efforts, the towering genius, the constitutional knowledge, the legal acumen, and undeviating allegiance and fidelity of their own O'Connell, had they gained their emancipation and the gradual resurrection of their country. And he would ask them to recollect the services they had rendered to the cause of religious freedom, and to bear in mind that the moment might be near at hand when they would be called upon to decide whether they would gradually sink down into a depression and insignificance greater and more obscure than any from which they had emerged, or be triumphantly conducted to national concord and permanent peace.

Mr. M. GIBSON wished to make a few observations in order to explain the course he should take on the motion of the noble lord. It was seldom that a motion made by the Government to bring in a bill was much discussed; and, having been in Parliament since 1838, with a short interval, that was the first occasion on which he had been invited to embark on a policy involving the principles embodied in the proposition of the noble lord; and he might therefore be permitted to hesitate in taking any course in a matter of that grave importance without full deliberation, and without being fully satisfied in his own mind that his reasons for whatever course he might take were founded upon pure considerations. He had frequently been asked to oppose the removal of the disabilities from some of his fellow-countrymen, which disabilities had been laid on them on account of their religious opinions; but he said again that was the first time he had been invited to impose disabilities on men on account of such opinions. For what was the proposal of the noble lord? The noble lord invited him to join him in passing a penal law against men who desired, by voluntary aid and association among themselves, to support that form of ecclesiastical discipline which they believed to be best calculated to promote the religion they professed. This was not a proposal on the part of the English Catholics, calling upon the Legislature to invest their religion with legislative freedom, or to give the British Legislature power to tax this country for the purpose of spreading the Roman Catholic religion. It was nothing of that kind; but it was a proposal from those who, he could hardly think, had any jurisdiction in the case, that the Parliament—not asked to dip into the pockets of the Exchequer, or impose any law upon the people of England with reference to this subject—should go out of their way without, as it appeared to him, having any jurisdiction in the matter, to impose penalties upon men for carrying out that form of religious discipline which they thought in their consciences was the best mode to promote the object they had in view. He could hardly think, after all, that it was intended to carry this measure out. There were various reports abroad tending to that impression; in fact, he had seen that morning a statement in a leading organ—the *Times*, a paper understood to shadow forth the views of the Government—to the effect that Ireland was to be left out of the bill. Now, if Ireland were to be left out of the bill, or if there were any tacit understanding that the bill should pass, but not be enforced in Ireland, it appeared to him that it would have been far better not to have put Ireland into the bill at all. It appeared to him, further, very strange that the House should be invited to apply to the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland provisions which were not applied to the Roman Catholics in the other portions of her Majesty's dominions. If it was so essential to prevent, by this law of pains and penalties, the episcopal organisation of the Roman Catholics in this country, why was it not equally essential to prevent that organisation in the British colonies, in North America, in Australia, and elsewhere? If to any part of her Majesty's dominions this measure was properly applicable, why not to all? Surely the interference of a foreign potentate was equally to be resisted in our possessions abroad as in the three kingdoms at home? If it were the fact that the appointment by the Pope of Rome of bishops in the realm of England was, according to the law of nations, a violation of the supremacy of the Crown, and of the independence of the country, then, manifestly, it was the duty of the Government not to shrink from vindicating that supremacy and that independence in all her Majesty's dominions throughout the world. It was impossible, he thought, to gainsay this proposition, and therefore, when he found that the bill was only to apply to the United Kingdom, he felt that those who supported it must be insincere when they spoke of it as based upon temporal, secular considerations, having reference to the Queen's supremacy, and to the independence of the country. The House had been invited to come to the consideration of this question under feelings of insult and indignation. They were constantly told that, if they did not feel themselves insulted and indignant, they ought to feel insulted and to be indignant. Now, he himself quite agreed with the Bishop of St. David's, Dr. Thirlwall, that there had been no insult in the matter on the part of the Roman Catholics, and he therefore came to the consideration of the question perfectly free from excitement. They were also constantly told that those who supported this measure were the advocates of religious liberty; and it was said, "Don't be alarmed; the thing only looks like a penal statute on the face of it; if you scrutinise it you will find nothing of the sort in it, for, be assured, that gentlemen who have always advocated the broad principles of religious liberty would not support a law of pains and penalties on account of religion." This, however, was not the first time they had heard professions of religious liberty from men who were advocating penal laws. Nothing was more common on the part of those who advocated penal disabilities against the Roman Catholics in former times, on the very account of their religion, than to say, at the same moment, that they were the advocates of religious liberty, and that it was precisely for the sake of religious liberty that they desired to keep down the Roman Catholics and the Roman Catholic religion. Lord Eldon, for example, a great authority in those times, used always to say that he should be the last man in the world to interfere with perfect freedom of conscience in any person, but that reasons of State policy made it necessary to exclude Roman Catholics from the enjoyment of equal civil privileges with other men, and that this had nothing to do with any infringement of religious liberty. It had been alleged, that as the English Roman Catholics owed a divided allegiance, they were very likely to aid the temporal purposes of the Pope, and that they were therefore unfit to make laws for this country. He, for one, therefore, should not be deterred from scrutinising this measure narrowly merely because its supporters talked about religious liberty. They were told that the country had taken the matter up in a spirit quite in accord-

ance with the spirit of religious liberty, but, looking at the proceedings which had taken place in different parts of England, he did not find that absence of discussion as to the distinctive tenets of the Roman Catholic faith which was attributed to them; on the contrary, he found those differences distinctly put forward as reasons for enacting such a measure as the present. Dr. Cumming would be admitted to be a great authority for the statement as to what was the ground on which the country demanded this law. What said Dr. Cumming? In one of his lectures against Papal aggression he distinctly said this: "That the teaching of Cardinal Wiseman was the best reason of protest against his intrusion as Archbishop of Westminster." His religious teaching was the reason against Cardinal Wiseman, according to Dr. Cumming; not that he had been appointed by a foreign potentate—not that he had violated the supremacy of the Crown and the independence of the country, but that his teaching did not suit Dr. Cumming. Take the opinion of the noble Premier himself. He held in his hand a letter signed by the noble lord, dated "Downing-street, November, 1850," and printed for distribution at 5s. per hundred, by Westerton, Knightsbridge; printed, by the way, "against the act in that case made and provided," seeing that it was printed upon unstamped paper, so that everybody who sold, or exposed to sale, or bought copies of the same, was liable for each offence to a penalty of 20*l.*; and in that letter the noble lord denounced the proceedings as an aggression of the Pope on our Protestantism; so that, according to the noble lord, not the power of the Queen was in peril, but only the "isms." Then there was Dr. McNeill, in his lecture at Exeter Hall—orthodox person and orthodox place, as the hon. member for Oxford University must fully admit. What said Dr. McNeill to the Duke of Manchester, in the chair, and the assembled audience:—

"My Lord Duke," said Dr. McNeill, "it is the bounden duty of British Christians to guard against domestic intercourse with Roman Catholics. If you allow domestic intercourse with Roman Catholics—if you allow your sons and daughters to become intimate with those of Roman Catholics, you cannot with a good grace, or consistently with your duty as parents, turn round, after allowing the intimacy, and forbid the marriage. If you object to such marriages, it is your duty to draw up in time. It may sound very bigoted to separate man from man in the community, but I am persuaded that one-half of our misery has been traceable to this domestic intercourse with Roman Catholics. If, instead of the unclean thing being touched and fondled, we had, as the Apostle said, 'come out from among, and be separate,' much that is to be deplored would not have taken place. But you have fondled the unclean thing—you have dallied with it—you have taken it to your breast, until at length it has turned round and stung you."

These were the sentiments of a member of that State Church whose rights the House was called upon to vindicate, and for whom they were to create popular attachment by vilifying and abusing persons of another religion. But the noble lord, in that same letter which laid the foundation of all this movement—a movement which, by the way, he did not believe had at all reached the working-classes, had himself made a violent aggression upon Protestantism, and, by an exercise of private judgment extremely rash, to say the least of it, had, as Jove from his chair, issued a sort of divinity-proclamation from Downing-street, deciding what was superstition and what was not. An authoritative, duly constituted tribunal, had only the other day, after much deliberation, declared itself unable and incompetent to declare what was the doctrine of the Church upon a particular point—baptismal regeneration; yet the noble lord had not hesitated to send forth from Downing-street his proclamation touching superstition. Suppose the noble lord, as Prime Minister, authorised to make such a proclamation, and to give it effect; on the same supposition, a Roman Catholic not being precluded by the Constitution from becoming Prime Minister, you might next year have a Roman Catholic Premier proclaiming that certain other things were superstitious, or you might have a Tractarian Prime Minister denouncing the Trinity itself as a superstitious notion; the result of which proclamations might be very great national evils. Now, in his opinion, if there was one thing more than another incumbent upon those who had the administration of public affairs, it was that they should moderate and pacify the religious animosities which might spring up in the country, and most carefully avoid anything calculated in the slightest degree to aggravate them. It was quite preposterous that because the members of the Established Church were quarrelling among themselves, the Roman Catholics, who had nothing to do with the quarrel, should have a bill of pains and penalties levelled against them. The House was called upon to pass this law against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, on the ground that they had had bishops appointed over them in the only way in which they could be appointed over them, by the Pope; that these bishops had had districts assigned to them, the only course by which, as bishops, they could be made useful; and that these bishops, the only intelligible course open to them, had taken the names of the districts to which they had been appointed. The noble lord had made an unworthy use of the term "governed," which occurred in Cardinal Wiseman's apostolic letter. The term was one addressed solely to the Cardinal's own clergy, and to the faithful of his Church, not to the nation at large, and had no other meaning in that document than it had in all other similar documents—the spiritual jurisdiction,

namely, conceded to him by those of his own religion who chose voluntarily to submit to that jurisdiction. It had nothing at all to do with temporal government. By the measure now proposed they were going to lessen the liberty given to the Roman Catholics under the Emancipation Act. If all the penalties in statutes were to be construed strictly, it was obvious that, inasmuch as there was a penalty of 100*l.* for the assumption of titles already enjoyed by the dignitaries of the Established Church, the assumption of other titles could not be considered to come within the restriction. Therefore, by this bill they would be taking a retrograde step in preventing the assumption of titles not forbidden to be taken by the Emancipation Act. No reasonable ground had been assigned for the present measure, for though they were told so much of the supremacy of the Crown, he knew of no supremacy in the United Kingdom but the supremacy of the law; and if the law were not broken, it was impossible the supremacy of the Crown could be infringed, because the prerogatives and acts of the Crown must be used and framed in a spirit of obedience to those laws. Why, then, should these eternal complaints be heard that the supremacy of the Crown was infringed, the rights of the Establishment invaded, the independence of the nation attacked? These expressions amounted in his opinion to claptrap. He would be no party to imposing penalties on Roman Catholics for carrying out their own voluntary ecclesiastical arrangements, supported by their own voluntary subscriptions, without infringing the rights of any other parties. He could not understand how supporters of the voluntary principle among Dissenters could consistently be advocates of this bill. He regretted that the noble lord in his speech should, with a view of preparing the House for this bill, have referred to various acts of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in Ireland and elsewhere in a manner calculated to prejudice the mind. When the noble lord was a supporter of a system of mixed instruction, it did not appear fair that he should attempt to raise a prejudice by alleging that Roman Catholic ecclesiastics interfered in the question of education in Ireland. Would the noble lord name twelve bishops of the Protestant Church who would advocate the separation of secular from religious instruction? The noble lord quoted the opinion of M. Dupin on the Church of Rome. He (Mr. Gibson) would give the noble lord a French quotation also, relating to the Church of England, which would form a sort of pendant to that of the noble lord. What did M. Guizot, a great Protestant—a great Protestant Reformer—say of the Church of England? He said, “The English Church is as corrupt as ever was that of Rome, and far more servile.” The quotation was entirely provoked by that of the noble lord. The charge was, that an aggression had been made by the Church of Rome on England. Did English missionaries get no support, ay, and in a physical sense, in making aggressions on foreign countries? An instance might be adduced of what looked much more like an aggression than the proceedings of the Pope. The *Overland Mail* of November 23th, 1850, contained a paragraph stating—

“In our last overland summary we referred to the difficulties at Fuh-chau, arising out of certain missionaries of the Church of England having obtained and insisted on retaining possession of a temple within the city, very much against the wishes of the people, who, in their excitement, threatened to destroy the building. Their violence, however, has been restrained for the time by the authorities, who appear to have acted with much prudence and decision; but, while exerting themselves to protect the missionaries from personal injury, they at the same time protest against the course pursued by the rev. gentlemen as both illegal and impolitic, and have issued several manifestoes on the subject, in one of which it is attempted to be shown, not altogether unsuccessfully, that they are acting in contravention of the treaty. We have now received copies of two of these documents, which, however, are too long for insertion at present. The missionaries, it is said, are acting in accordance with the instructions of Bishop Smith, who, as he proposes visiting Fuh-chau during his present cruise, may, after personal inquiry on the spot, be induced to modify them.”

That looked like a physical aggression—missionaries taking possession of a temple, a bishop making his cruise in a man-of-war. The screw-sloop *Reynard* arriving at Shanghai on the 14th of October, conveying a communication from the British Government relating to the missionaries:—

“Repeated complaints having been made to the British Government, it was arranged that a man-of-war should occasionally be despatched to look in upon Dr. Bettelheim at Loochoo, in order to afford him the countenance of the Government by whom he had been adopted.”

Loochoo was an independent country. Dr. Bettelheim was a converted Jew, a native of Hungary, but a naturalised British subject.

“The *Reynard* anchored at Napa harbour on the 3rd of October, and remained a week, during which time two or three interviews were held with the native authorities, both on shore and on board. It was deemed expedient to exclude Dr. Bettelheim from all share in the negotiations, and the Bishop of Victoria, who was on board, on his way to the northern ports (assisted in interpretation by his Chinese amanuensis Chun-Chung, a Latin as well as Chinese scholar), is stated to have contributed materially to bring about the good results which it is hoped will follow from the firm yet conciliatory tone adopted.”

Interviews took place between the viceroy and the commander of the vessel. At the last interview—

"It was deemed advisable for the officers of the *Reynard* to appear in full dress, attended by a guard of about fifty men, who were marshalled opposite the guard of the mandarins. The various complaints by Dr. Bettelheim were made the subject of conversation, and explanatory papers were exchanged, but it was judged better to limit the proceedings as far as possible to the delivery of the intimation from the British Government, inculcating the necessity of better treatment of Dr. Bettelheim, among whose complaints one of the most serious seems to have been an assault on him by some police while engaged in his missionary duties. At the termination of the negotiations presents were exchanged, and the Viceroy and other mandarins, in return for their hospitality, partook of an entertainment on board the *Reynard*. She was the first steamer that had been seen there, and, though it was evident her arrival had made a considerable impression, her departure was probably regarded with entire satisfaction."

This was a description of aggression which ought not to be authorised. The noble lord did not like the interference of ecclesiastics in temporal and secular affairs. Cordially concurring in the opinion that the duties of those rev. gentlemen were to give religious consolation to their respective communities, he (Mr. Gibson) regretted that the noble lord had favoured the House in laying the groundwork of the argument in favour of the bill with the citation of only two authorities that bore on the matter in hand, and these were two ecclesiastics of the English Church. The noble lord mentioned the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury. His words were—

"What I propose is, in the first place, to prevent the assumption of any title taken, not only from any diocese now existing, but from any territory or any place within any part of the United Kingdom. That provision is in conformity with a proposition which was made by the Bishop of London in answer to one of the addresses which was presented to him. He said, that he thought that not only we ought to prohibit the assumption of any title or rank already existing in this country, but any title derived from any place in the United Kingdom. Therefore I have agreed with that suggestion. Perhaps I may mention, that when I informed the Archbishop of Canterbury that it was not intended to institute a prosecution, he said, 'I did not expect that the Government would institute a prosecution, but what I do expect is that some legislation should take place upon this subject.'"

To go to Dr. Blomfield, enjoying an elevated position at his case, surrounded with all the pomps and vanities of the world, and not being exempt, undoubtedly, from the infirmities of human nature, desirous to stand alone in his glory—to ask him what sort of indignity was to be thrown on Dr. Wiseman, or to ask even Dr. Sumner, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was a remarkable proceeding. If ever there were temporal affairs with which ecclesiastics ought not to interfere, this was one of all others in which they ought not to have meddled; for it would be imputed to them, whether guilty or not, that they were acting from jealous feelings, and from a desire to maintain an ascendancy of their own. Would the noble lord have thought of applying to Dr. Wiseman in a case where proceedings were to be taken against Dr. Blomfield? The subject ought to be dealt with, not under the advice of ecclesiastics of the Established Church, but as a national question; and legislation upon it ought to be based purely on secular considerations as to what was best calculated to promote the peace, happiness, and harmony of all classes of her Majesty's subjects. Hon. members must often have observed a clause inserted in Acts of Parliament to the effect that "this act may be amended or repealed during the present session." Such a clause he would have put into the bill: "And be it enacted, that this act may be broken with impunity during the present and all future sessions of Parliament." For he was persuaded, however the noble lord might have changed his opinion with respect to the puerility of legislation against the assumption of titles, and for preventing communications with Rome, that the law now proposed would be nugatory, and was only calculated to produce great irritation; that it had been well described by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire as "a piece of petty persecution," and he, for one, if he were never to give another vote in that House, would use his utmost exertions to resist the passing of this bill.

Mr. C. Bruce thought it would have been more for the credit of the House had the noble lord been allowed to introduce the bill when he first proposed it, and would have abstained from addressing the House had it not been for some observations made the other day by the hon. member for Ayrshire (Mr. Oswald). The hon. member professed to express the opinion of the people of Scotland, whom he described as quiescent, and, as a proof, he stated that there had been no meeting in the county of Ayr. The people of Scotland were not disposed to interfere when they were not called upon, and had such reliance on the firmness, energy, love of truth, and attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty which marked the English character, as to know that the English people would carry out their own repressive measures against this aggression. If aid were needed, that of his fellow-countrymen beyond the Tweed would not be wanting. The hon. gentleman argued that, because there had been no interference with the Free Church, Parliament was not at liberty to interfere with the Roman Catholic assumption of ecclesiastical titles. But the case was entirely misunderstood by his honourable friend. The Free Church did not call itself the Established Church of Scotland. The very adoption of the term "Free Church" at once

pointed out the purely voluntary limitation and spiritual character of the position they took up. Granting, however, for a moment, that there was some analogy between the two Churches in regard to the position they occupied, there was this vital difference in the two cases—the one was that of a tolerant Protestant Church confining itself to matters spiritual; the other was that of a Church that never separated the spiritual from the temporal, and which always aimed at subjecting the temporal to the spiritual power. Allusion had been made to the Scotch Episcopalians, but neither was any analogy to the Papal aggression found there. By the law and constitution of Scotland, the old Episcopal sees were entirely abolished; and therefore, when the Episcopal clergy assumed the titles of those sees, they did not commit such an aggression upon the constitution as had been done in England when ecclesiastical titles of honour or dignity were assumed by the Roman Catholic bishops. He regarded the speech of the noble lord, on introducing this bill, as one worthy of the Protestant Minister of a Protestant Sovereign, but he must say that the conclusion of that speech was lame and impotent. The noble lord must go farther than he had done. He must not content himself with merely prohibiting titles; he must render penal the introduction of bulls and rescripts. The noble lord must put down by law all monkeries, whether black, white, or gray, or whatever colour they might be. The hon. gentleman near him (Mr. F. Peel) said that the great manifestation of sentiment that had taken place throughout England was only valuable as bringing together the various Protestant sects, and giving them confidence in the maintenance of the great truths they all held; but he could not agree with him when he so limited the extraordinary expression of feeling and sentiment that had come from the people of England. It was the duty of Parliament to consider the wishes of the people on this question, and to give them effect, and they would certainly fail in their duty if in any measure they adopted they fell short of the demands which the people of England had most unequivocally put forth on this subject.

Mr. MAULE wished to contrast the speech of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down with the speeches that had come from the lower parts of the House, in order to illustrate the fact that Government had steered in this matter a middle course between extreme opinions on the one side and the other, and had exactly suited their legislation to the exigencies of the case. The right hon. gentleman the member for Manchester (Mr. Gibson) said they should legislate on this question in a national view, and he went on to observe that this should not be made matter of legislation, because the Roman Catholic bishops set up no claim for taxing those over whom they were to exercise a spiritual jurisdiction. He also thought they should act in a national spirit in all their acts; but that House had higher duties even than those connected with taxation to transact. It had to maintain the Protestant constitution of this country as established by those unwritten laws and customs that had come down from our forefathers, and which they were bound to deliver as a sacred trust to those that came after them. The right hon. gentleman endeavoured to distract the attention of the House by misrepresentations of the conduct of the noble lord at the head of the Government. He stated that the noble lord from his chair in Downing-street had issued a certain letter in which he had endeavoured to instruct the country in spiritual and ecclesiastical doctrines. Now, his noble friend did no such thing. In all that referred to anything ecclesiastical, he quoted almost *verbatim* the words of the Bishop of London. Thus, he charged his noble friend with having taken counsel with the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury before he introduced his measure; but his noble friend had distinctly denied both these allegations. He gathered from the writings of the Bishop of London what his views were on the subject, and in framing his measure neither he nor his colleagues were aided by the advice of any ecclesiastical authority whatever. The right hon. gentleman also blamed the noble lord with having stirred up the recent agitation; but it was a well-known fact that intelligence of the aggression had reached this country three weeks at least before the letter of the noble lord was written, and that the country was roused, and the bar had assembled, before that letter was heard of. The hon. member for Ayrshire said the people of Scotland were indifferent to this subject, and yet he stated in the same breath that no man was so much opposed to Popery in every form as was the Scotsman. He agreed in that description of his countrymen. He had sometimes, indeed, had occasion to lament that they had carried that feeling to an excess, but at the same time this convinced him that the present aggression was a step that every yeoman or farmer in Scotland fully comprehended, and was ready, if it was thought necessary, to attend a public meeting to condemn it. The hon. gentleman said there was a strong parallel between this case and that of the Free Church. Now, the disruption that took place in 1843 was one of the noblest as it was one of the saddest events of modern days; but, he asked, what similitude there was between that event and the aggression of the Romish Church? He said when the ministers left the Established Church they assumed titles. What titles? Then he said they divided the country into districts and parochial divisions. They did no such thing. There was, in truth, no similarity between the cases. It would be far better if the hon. gentleman would leave the Free Church and the Established Church in the position in which they now stood. Their differences were

beginning to be forgotten. They were meeting together for Christian purposes on the same platform, and were uniting in the same great endeavour to overturn the infidelity of the cities and large towns of Scotland. He recommended the hon. gentleman therefore not to rake up those differences that were becoming dormant in the country, nor try to awaken again the religious strifes that were happily dying away. The Episcopalian Bishops in Scotland had also been referred to, but neither was their case analogous to that of this Episcopal aggression. In Scotland the Episcopal body was only a dissenting sect; but it was a sect that was doing a great deal of good among its own communicants. They lived in peace with other men, and were engaged along with other denominations in promoting the religious interests of the large towns of Scotland. It had been said that the great party to which the noble lord belonged were not entitled to any of the credit of Catholic emancipation; but Sir Robert Peel, who finally carried that measure, had most generously given his noble friend and the party with whom he acted the fullest credit for their eminent services in that cause. The Government had but taken the course they were bound to take in defence of our Protestant constitution, which had been wantonly and offensively attacked. It had been said here was but the imposition of the canon law upon the Catholic community who voluntarily submitted to it; but the fact was, that no earnest Catholic could give a voluntary submission to the canon-law—it was imperative upon him that he should submit to it. The address carried up to the Queen by Lord Lovat and others proved that the Catholics regarded obedience to their spiritual superiors as an obligation of virtue. For himself (Mr. F. Maule), he should give his vote fearless of what might be said of him. He had provided for Catholic soldiers (and they were no small number in our army) having the full enjoyment of the ordinances of their Church—he had proved himself no bigot. With no feeling of hatred to his Catholic fellow-countrymen, and with proper respect for their religious sentiments, he should do his duty as became a sincere and loyal Protestant, a member of the Legislature, and a servant of the Sovereign.

Mr. SCULLY would only detain the House with one or two observations upon the remarks of the Secretary-at-War. The right hon. gentleman denied that the noble lord's letter was the origin of the agitation; but certainly there were few meetings before that letter, and as soon as it was written the cries of "Mummeries of superstition" and "No Popery" ran through the country. Therefore the vile speeches that had been made might be connected with that letter. As for the allusion to the sentiment of the hon. member for Carlou (Mr. Sadleir), what that hon. member stated was, that Emancipation was not the gift of Sir R. Peel, but the result of an agitation conducted by Mr. O'Connell. Then, with regard to the reference to the canon law, Roman Catholics were bound to submit to the head of the Church in spiritual matters, but in any temporal matter (whether the canon law affected it or not) they were independent. Allusion had been made also to the army, who might be called on to support the civil power in enforcing this penal law; and would it be right so to call upon a force who might be—he did not say would be—influenced by the feeling of religion on such an occasion? Had there been no instances in which they had been taken from their places of worship without sufficient grounds? The Secretary-at-War might say that all Scotland and all England were for legislation such as now proposed; all Ireland was against it. Even Presbyterians and the Free Church had refused to join in the agitation that had been going on. Let the Government beware, or they might kindle in that country a flame never to be extinguished except with blood, anarchy, and confusion. He (Mr. Scully) trusted that the reference to Ireland would be expunged from the bill.

Colonel SIBTHORP would not interpose to delay the division except while he just stated, that, not placing the slightest confidence in the Government, yet he could not oppose the bringing in of this bill. He owed a duty to his Sovereign, in whose attachment to the Church and Constitution he placed implicit reliance, and who had committed the subject in her speech to the consideration of Parliament.

Mr. MUNTZ wished shortly to state the grounds why he felt it his duty to give his vote for bringing in the bill. He considered this one of the most disagreeable questions that had ever come before the public since he had had the honour of taking a part in political affairs. He had not mixed himself up in any way with any of the proceedings that had occurred on this subject. He had wished to hear from all parties their opinions, so that he might, if possible, be able to learn the real merits of the question. The meeting which was held on this matter in the borough he had the honour to represent separated without any decision being come to on either side. The difficulty of the question was like all the difficulties that were connected with matters of religion. Those who embarked in it were sure to come in collision with the two Churches, so that he might well say—the plague take both your Churches. He never questioned any man's religion; but there were circumstances connected with the present subject of a much more extended nature than the mere toleration of religion. When he looked to the condition of the Roman Catholic Church, he felt some doubt on the question. He could not say that he found it to be the practice of the Government of any country to give to the Pope a power of nominating bishops without the consent of the Sovereign of that country. He was willing to give to the Roman Catholics every right and privilege which they at present possessed, but he

was not willing to give them more power than they had ever hitherto enjoyed in any country. There was one remark which he must be permitted to make, and that was, that he had searched history in vain to find a single instance of any country where the Roman Catholic religion prevailed in which the people enjoyed real liberty.

Mr. BROTHERTON had taken no part in the agitation of this question out of doors, nor did he intend to take any part in the debate; but he had endeavoured to ascertain what were the real merits of the case. Both the hon. members for Manchester had placed him in rather a painful position. They knew that the towns of Manchester and Salford were intimately connected, and that they were, in fact, one and the same constituency. Now, he had reason to believe that the sentiments which had been expressed by those two hon. members were not the sentiments of that constituency. He would not yield to either of his hon. friends in a desire to advocate every measure calculated to promote civil and religious liberty. He had never given a vote against civil and religious liberty being enjoyed by any class of her Majesty's subjects. But the grounds on which he considered it to be his duty to vote for the introduction of this bill were these—that from the opinions of the most eminent lawyers, and of the most enlightened statesmen, and from the sentiments expressed by the community at large, it did appear that in this instance the rights of the Sovereign had been infringed, and the liberty and independence of the nation assailed. He did not consider this to be a religious question, but one which affected her Majesty's prerogative, and the rights and liberties of her Majesty's subjects. He was not called upon to defend the Established Church, or to say one word against the Roman Catholic religion; though neither was he required to speak aught in favour of the Pope, in order to destroy the Established Church. But he consented to the introduction of this bill, bearing in mind what was avowed by the noble lord, that it was not his intention to infringe upon the civil or religious rights of any class of her Majesty's subjects. In giving his vote for the introduction of the bill he considered he was doing so in obedience to the sentiments of the great majority of his constituents. He gave no opinion as to whether the measure should extend to Ireland; but he believed that in assenting to the introduction of the measure into this country he was acting equally in accordance with the feelings of the Roman Catholics of England. He would enable the House to judge as to the right he had for entertaining this opinion. He had received several letters from Roman Catholics of great influence in Manchester and Salford. There were, in fact, no persons who exercised greater influence than they did in both boroughs. They were the constituents of his hon. friends as well as being his own constituents. He would read a letter which he had received from one of them. It ran thus:—"I feel considerable interest in the matter, and am confident that unless Government will protect us all our charity, land and all other property given to our charities, will pass into the sole control of the Court of Rome. As an Englishman, I seek to have our charities administered according to the laws of our own country, and not by a foreign Court and under foreign laws." The vote, therefore, which he was now about to give would be given from a conviction that he was voting in favour of the civil and religious liberties of the Roman Catholics, and in the firm belief that the bill would not be an infringement of the religious rights of any class of her Majesty's subjects.

Mr. F. O'CONNOR thought the debate had lasted sufficiently long at this stage of the measure. He therefore trusted hon. members would not protract the debate, but go to a division at once.

Mr. SCHOLEFIELD said that, as he differed from his hon. colleague, and also from a considerable number of his constituents, on this question, he wished to state the reason for his voting against the introduction of the bill. As a member of the Church of England, he could not be supposed to have any sympathies with the Pope or with Cardinal Wiseman, whose proceedings he confessed appeared to have been very impolitic, even as regarded the interests of the Roman Catholics themselves, as well as in some degree disrespectful to the Crown. But his opinion was, that these proceedings did not refer to the doctrines, but to the discipline of the Church of Rome; and he thought that that discipline could not be carried out unless it were done by the way the Pope was desirous of doing it—namely, by the appointment of a hierarchy.

The House then divided; the numbers were—

For the introduction of the bill	395
Against it	63
Majority for introducing the bill	—332

A BILL TO PREVENT THE ASSUMPTION OF CERTAIN ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES IN RESPECT OF PLACES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

(AS PROPOSED, PREPARED, AND BROUGHT IN BY LORD JOHN RUSSELL, SIR GEORGE GREY, AND SIR JOHN ROMILLY, ATTORNEY-GENERAL.)

Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 14th February, 1851.

ARRANGEMENT OF CLAUSES.

Preamble recites 10 G. 4, c. 7, s. 24.

Penalty of one hundred pounds for assuming titles to pretended sees or dioceses, &c., in the United Kingdom; sect. 1.

All deeds or writings under the prohibited titles void; 2.

Endowments of pretended sees, &c., and gifts in favour of persons designated by the prohibited titles, to enure to the use of her Majesty; and all powers in relation to charitable and other trusts, or otherwise vested in persons so designated, may be exercised as her Majesty may direct; 3.

Every person who may be liable to be sued for any penalty shall, in any suit in Equity, relative to any assurance, transfer, will, &c., be compelled to answer upon oath, notwithstanding such liability; 4.

[*Note*.—The words printed in *Italics* are proposed to be inserted in committee.]

Whereas by the act of the tenth year of King George the Fourth, chapter seven, after reciting that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, and likewise the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, were by the respective Acts of Union of England and Scotland, and of Great Britain and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably, and that the right and title of archbishops to their respective provinces, of bishops to their sees, and of deans to their deaneries, as well in England as in Ireland, had been settled and established by law, it was enacted, that if any person after the commencement of that act, other than the person thereunto authorised by law, should assume or use the name, style, or title of archbishop of any province, bishop of any bishopric, or dean of any deanery, in England or Ireland, he should for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of one hundred pounds: and whereas it may be doubted whether the recited enactment extends to the assumption of the title of archbishop or bishop of a pretended province or diocese, or archbishop or bishop of a city, place, or territory in England or Ireland, not being the see, province, or diocese of any archbishop or bishop recognised by law; but the attempt to establish, under colour of authority from the see of Rome or otherwise, such pretended sees, provinces, or dioceses is illegal and void, and the assumption of ecclesiastical titles in respect thereof is inconsistent with the rights intended to be protected by the said enactment: and whereas it is expedient to prohibit the assumption of such titles in respect of any places within the United Kingdom: be it enacted therefore by the Queen's most excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, That—

I. If, after the passing of this act, any person other than a person thereunto authorised by law in respect of an archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery of the United Church of England and Ireland assume or use the name, style, or title of archbishop, bishop, or dean of any city, town, or place, or of any territory or district (under any designation or description whatsoever) in the United Kingdom, whether such city, town, or place, or such territory or district, be or be not the see or the province, or co-extensive with the province of any archbishop, or the see or the diocese, or co-extensive with the diocese, of any bishop, or the seat or place of the church of any dean, or co-extensive with any deanery, of the said United Church, the person so offending shall, for every such offence, forfeit and pay the sum of *one hundred pounds*, to be recovered as provided by the recited act.

II. Any deed or writing made, signed, or executed after the passing of this act, by or under the authority of any person, in or under any name, style, or title which such person is by the recited act and this act, or either of them, prohibited from assuming or using, shall be void.

III. Whereby any assurance, transfer, will, limitation, or declaration of use or trust, or other instrument, made or executed after the passing of this act, any real or personal property, or any profit or advantage to be had therefrom, is assured, given, or made applicable, or ex-

pressed or intended to be assured, given, or made applicable, directly or indirectly, for or towards the endowment or maintenance of any archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery intitled or in anywise designated or described as an archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery of any city, town, or place, territory or district in the United Kingdom (except the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and deaneries of the said united Church), or for any purposes connected with or referring to the maintenance or continuance of any archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery (except as aforesaid) so intitled, designated, or described, or of the titular province, see, diocese, or limits thereof, or where by any such assurance, transfer, will, limitation, declaration, or other instrument, any real or personal property, profit, or advantage, or any power, authority, or discretion (whether for private or personal benefit, or for charitable or other purposes), to be exercised over or in relation to any real or personal property, or such profit or advantage as aforesaid, is assured, given, or vested, or expressed or intended to be assured, given, or vested, to or in any person by any name, style, or title of archbishop, bishop, or dean, which by the recited act and this act or either of them such person is prohibited from assuming or using, or to or in any person who in such assurance, transfer, will, limitation, declaration, or other instrument is in anywise designated, mentioned, or referred to as being or claiming to be, or as being called or known or reputed to be archbishop, bishop, or dean, under any name, style, or title with such person is so prohibited from assuming or using, or to or in any other person therein described as chaplain or other subordinate of the person so designated, mentioned, or referred to, or to or in any person in anywise described by means of a reference to a name, style or title of which, by the said act and this act or either of them, the assumption or use is prohibited, all the real or personal property, profit, or advantage aforesaid, or such estate or interest therein, as but for this enactment would have been in anywise applicable to any of the purposes aforesaid, or would have vested in or enured to the use of the person to or in whom the same is so expressed or intended to be assured, given, or vested, shall, without any office or inquisition found, vest in and enure to the use of her Majesty, and shall and may be disposed of and applied as her Majesty shall be pleased by warrant under her sign manual to direct, whether such direction be to apply the same according and pursuant to the intents and purposes declared in and by the instruments hereinbefore mentioned or otherwise; and all such power, authority, and discretion as aforesaid, so far as the same but for this enactment might have been exercised by the person in whom the same is so expressed or intended to be vested, may be exercised by such persons in such manner as her Majesty may be pleased by warrant under her sign manual to direct.

IV. Every person who may be liable to be sued for any penalty imposed by the recited enactment and this act, or either of them, shall in any suit or proceeding in equity in relation to any such assurance, transfer, will, limitation, declaration of use or trust, or other instrument as herein-before mentioned, or in relation to any secret or other trust, or other matter whatsoever, be compellable to answer upon oath notwithstanding his liability to such penalty in the same manner as if no such liability existed: provided that no answer of such person in such suit or proceeding as aforesaid, nor any matter disclosed or made known only by means of such answer, shall be admitted as evidence against such person in any action for the recovery of such penalty.

Nos. XXIV. and XXV., completing the Series of Pamphlets, contain, in addition to a variety of important documents, a Portrait of Cardinal Wiseman, a Preface and Conclusion by the Editor, a Title-page, and an Index of the Contents of the entire Series.

The Series may also be had bound in cloth, price 4s. Covers for binding the Series may be procured from the Publisher, price 1s. 2d.

THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

SPEECH OF THE EARL OF ABERDEEN IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, FEB. 28, 1851;
LORD STANLEY'S SPEECH;
SPEECH OF SIR JAMES GRAHAM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEB. 28, 1851;
THE IRISH CATHOLIC PRELATES & THE "PENAL LAWS;"
CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN IRELAND—A PLAIN STATEMENT BY VINCENT SCULLY;
AND
MR. SERJEANT SHEE'S SPEECH.

SPEECH OF THE EARL OF ABERDEEN IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—FEB. 28, 1851.

The Earl of ABERDEEN.—My lords, the noble marquis having stated the circumstances under which the failure of the negotiations entered into by Lord J. Russell for the re-construction of the Government have failed, it now is incumbent on me to explain to the House the motives for my conduct and the circumstances which led to the decision I thought it my duty to take. On Saturday morning, when the resignation of the noble lord and his colleagues took place, I had the honour of being commanded by her Majesty to attend at the palace. I did so on the evening of Saturday, and had the honour of an audience of her Majesty, at which I humbly expressed my readiness to co-operate in the re-construction of the Government upon any conditions which should appear to be consistent with my own convictions and which afforded the prospect of getting public support. I subsequently, in her Majesty's presence, met Lord John Russell and my friend Sir James Graham, and after mutual explanations on the subject, similar to those which I have now stated, we met Lord John Russell on the following day. The noble lord communicated to us the basis of agreement on which the Government was to be constructed, and the principal measures he proposed to introduce. I think we received this communication from Lord John Russell between 4 and 5 o'clock on Saturday, and we should have proceeded at once to consider those propositions, but, having been detained late at the palace that night, we reserved them for examination till the following day. On Monday, having made the necessary examination, we communicated to Lord John Russell our opinions on the subject. I need not enter into the various measures which were proposed for our adoption. Probably mutual explanations might have led ultimately to an agreement, as our differences were confined exclusively to a single measure. I felt undoubtedly an invincible repugnance to adopt the measure of penal legislation towards the Roman Catholic subjects of this country, by the prohibition of the assumption of ecclesiastical titles, and indeed I objected to any legislation of this kind upon the subject. I am quite aware that this is not the proper occasion to enter into any full discussion of this subject. I hope that at no distant time we may have an opportunity of considering this question when it comes before us in a regular manner. I shall then be ready to express more fully the views and opinions which I entertain; but I must, at the present moment, state to the House the deep convictions and feelings which induced me to come to such a decision as I have stated, and which led to a result so important to the great interests of the country as the failure of the attempt with which the noble lord was charged. I felt, then, that this kind of legislation was very ineffective. It is difficult enough, at all times, by force of law, to give a criminal character to acts in themselves indifferent, so as to secure the willing obedience of mankind; but when such acts are performed from a sense of duty and religious obligation your laws become dead: conscience and opinion are beyond the sphere of your legislation. No doubt you may persecute, but we have had fatal experience of the effects of such a course. We have for 200 years tormented, successfully and effectually tormented, the Roman Catholics, but nevertheless we have found that instead of reducing we have only increased the number of our victims. I thought I saw in this measure a retrograde step towards a system of law which I had hoped was for ever and utterly abolished. I believed that in the late proceedings which had taken place no law had been violated, unless it may have been—and that is doubtful—some one of those barbarous laws the text of which still continues to disgrace the statute-book, but which had long been obsolete, and which very recently had been stigmatised by the Legislature itself. But though

I felt persuaded that a violation of law had taken place, I was not the less sensitive to the arrogant tone assumed by the Roman Pontiff and his cardinal, in the brief of the one and the pastoral letter of the other; and I felt that this might very properly have engaged the notice of her Majesty's Government, and even of Parliament. I saw, however, no sufficient ground for legislative interference with the view of abridging the religious liberty of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and of impeding the lawful and regular development and recognition of their episcopal Church. I found that my right hon. friend (Sir J. Graham) entirely coincided with me in this view; and I may mention to the House that this agreement was arrived at without the least concert or communication with each other. Since we parted towards the close of the last session of Parliament I have had no communication whatever upon any subject with my right hon. friend. Though living in a distant part of the country, I witnessed the excitement which prevailed throughout England on this subject. I thought, however, that the alarm and indignation which prevailed so generally were unfounded and irrational. I certainly felt no alarm myself. I had no inclination towards feelings of indignation, but rather towards contempt. But when I saw at public meetings persons attending whom I could not have expected to find there, and sentiments expressed which gave me equal surprise, I became more curious to know what was the opinion of my right hon. friend, and of others with whom I had been in the habit of acting, and for whose opinions I felt great respect. However, it appeared to me that this was not a subject upon which I could with propriety venture to question my right hon. friend, and in point of fact, until the day before the meeting of Parliament, I had not the most distant conception of what his opinion was. I then found him, to my great satisfaction, in all points coinciding with me in the view I entertained. This, I may say, was the case with all those persons with whom I had formerly been connected in official life, and whose opinions I consider entitled to the greatest respect. Until the day before yesterday I was entirely ignorant of the opinions, with one exception, of my former colleagues, and at this moment I am entirely ignorant of the opinions of some of them on this subject. I wish to state this to show that, whatever that opinion may be, it is not the result of any concert or communication with each other, and that it has been arrived at in a perfectly independent manner. It is true that the noble lord to whom was intrusted the formation of an Administration did propose to us material alterations and modifications of the bill to which I am now alluding, and to which we so decidedly objected. No doubt those alterations might have removed some of our objections to the provisions of the measure itself, but it is obvious that such alterations must have excited great disapprobation and disappointment among all those who represented the popular feeling upon this subject, and who were so much excited in hostility to the proceedings of the Court of Rome, while at the same time the very remnant of the bill would have been equally regarded as penal, unjust, and offensive by the great body of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. We therefore felt that it was impossible for us to make ourselves parties to a measure from which we could not anticipate any good, and from which we thought we had reason to apprehend very many and serious evils. On the failure of the attempt of the noble lord to form an Administration, her Majesty was pleased to send for me, and to request me to undertake that task. My lords, I am fully aware of my own deficiencies, and however unable I should be at any time, and especially at such a difficult moment as the present, to conduct the affairs of this great empire in such a manner as her Majesty's subjects have a right to expect, nevertheless there were circumstances in the actual condition of the country which might possibly have led me to make the attempt. But, with the knowledge I possessed that a measure of penal legislation had been introduced into the House of Commons, with the consent of a great majority of the members of that House, and believing, as I had reason to believe, that a majority as large of your lordships in this House entertained the same views upon the subject, your lordships will not be surprised to learn that I humbly intreated her Majesty to permit me to decline the task which her gracious favour would have imposed upon me. I felt, in the present state of matters, it would have been perfectly hopeless in me to attempt to enforce those views which I entertained, and from which I was determined not to recede, because I felt that I could be no party to any course which I believe would tend to kindle the flame of religious discord throughout the country, and increase the religious animosities and bitterness that unfortunately already prevailed. I entertain a confident opinion that a great change will at no distant period take place in the public sentiment, and, whether it shall be so or not, I trust your lordships will give me credit for the sincere convictions and for the deep sense of duty under which I acted. I trust your lordships will believe that nothing would have induced me to follow the course I adopted had I not been convinced that I acted according to the dictates of the soundest principles of wisdom and justice

LORD STANLEY'S SPEECH.

LORD STANLEY, having explained himself in reference to the other aspects of the ministerial crisis, said—One word now upon the important question of Papal aggression. My noble friend has stated his strong conviction that no penal measures should be adopted now, or at any time, for restricting religious opinion. No man can feel that more strongly than I do, or more entirely concur with my noble friend. I should be the last man to consent to the introduction of any measure which would deprive any portion of my fellow-countrymen of the free and full exercise of their religious opinions, and the free and full performance of their religious duties. But I must draw a distinction between penal laws directed against religious opinions

and Parliamentary legislation directed against foreign usurpation. I know not whether the Pope and his emissaries have violated the law or not; but Lord J. Russell, in his celebrated letter, declared his intention to ascertain from the law officers of the Crown whether the law had been violated, and stated that if it had not been violated he would propose an amendment of the law. I think the act of the Pope, in itself of minor importance, was rendered infinitely more important by the insulting tone and offensive manner in which it was, in the first instance, introduced—announced as the act of an authority claiming jurisdiction over the realm of England, and assuming to interfere with the undoubted rights and prerogatives of the Crown and with the independence of Parliament. I think that was a proceeding which it was impossible, consistently with the dignity of the Crown and of Parliament, to pass over; but I cannot say I approve of the mode in which it has been sought to meet that insult. I cannot but think that the measure which has been introduced by the Government bears upon the face of it the marks of passion and of haste rather than of mature and calm consideration; and for my own part I confess, if that were to be the extent of the legislation contemplated by the advisers of the Crown, I think with my noble friend above me that it would be better not to legislate at all than to legislate ineffectually. A strong feeling of indignation has been raised on the part of the Protestant portion of the community, vast indignation has been excited among the Roman Catholics, and after all a measure is introduced which will, I fear, be practically altogether inoperative. If the law had not been violated I think the offence would have been more aptly met by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament, declaring in the first instance the unconstitutional character of the aggression, not recognising the validity of the titles which were assumed to be conferred, and declaring that in virtue of those titles the holders or assumed holders of them had neither precedence nor authority of any kind within this realm. My noble friend above me may not feel disposed to go so far as this. I think the bill of the Government does not touch the real danger. I think it touches the insult, and it touches it ineffectually; but the real danger is this—the gradual growth and encroachment of the power of the Pope, and of the prelates acting under his authority, in interfering with matters not purely and strictly religious, and in assuming to themselves powers which, if not in violation of the law of the land, are at variance with that law. While I contend that religious freedom ought to be strictly guaranteed, I say, on the other hand, that Papal aggression ought to be as strenuously resisted now as it was resisted in the days of our ancestors; but I frankly say that I am not prepared to legislate upon this subject at the present moment. I do not think the amount of information before us as to the facts of the case justifies us in legislating, and this is a question of all others upon which, if you do legislate, you must legislate deliberately, upon full information, and in such a manner as to make your legislation effective. I believe the law is in a most anomalous state on this subject. The recent amendments of the law have left, in this case, the absurdity that it is declared high treason to introduce a bull or rescript from Rome, yet, though the offence is declared to be treason, the penalty is altogether taken away, and the law is thus rendered wholly inoperative. There are various assumptions of power in this country on the part of Roman Catholics with which it is right that Parliament and the country should be acquainted. For example, what effect will the fact of the Roman Catholic bishops being enabled to meet in synod have upon the binding character of their enactments? Do they, by acting in an organised body, obtain an authority recognised by all Roman Catholics as a legislative authority, which when they are not so acting they do not possess? If so, the question becomes of importance, not whether there shall be a Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, but whether there shall be in this country an *imperium in imperio*, a body of men acting in synod, and passing laws which, enforced by the most awful of all penalties—the spiritual censures of the Church, have a power over a vast portion of the Roman Catholic population superior to that of the law of the land? In 1829 the Roman Catholic Relief Act introduced various restrictions which were called at the time securities for Protestants. That measure required that registers should be kept of the members of all religious communities, and subjected to banishment persons who were not so registered. Is that a power which it is necessary to possess? If it is necessary to possess it, why is it not exercised? If it is not intended to be exercised, why does it remain upon your statute-book? We must, since 1829, have connived at the gradual encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church. We have shut our eyes to her encroachments on the law, but we have shut our eyes intentionally. We should take care that there shall be no connivance at such encroachments,—that there shall be no alternative between that which we prohibit and that which we distinctly allow. I think it unjust and unwise to prohibit by law that which you mean to permit in practice. I conceive that there are grave questions depending upon the position of Roman Catholics in this country with regard to the rights of their own Church, to the disposition of property, and the manner in which trust property is held for Roman Catholic purposes. I think it is a subject for inquiry how religious houses of various descriptions are carried on in this country; and it is a grave question whether all religious houses should not be subjected to the power of visitation, in order that it may be ascertained that no persons are retained within them contrary to the law of the land. But upon the whole of this question relative to the position of the Roman Catholic population, with regard to this State and to a foreign power, I believe that Parliament and the country are equally ill-informed. If it be necessary that Roman Catholics should have communications upon purely spiritual questions with Rome, I say, do not shut your eyes to the fact that these communications take place; permit such communications as may be necessary for purely religious purposes, but at the same time effectually prevent any proceedings which interfere with the civil rights

of her Majesty's subjects. This is a subject which ought to be dealt with upon a great scale, temperately, deliberately, and upon full information; and the loss of one, or even of two years, if it were necessary, would be an evil of little magnitude compared with the evil of dealing hastily and ineffectually, passionately, and in an irritating manner, with this great and important question, the chief evils and dangers of which you leave wholly untouched by your legislation. I have recommended that, in both Houses of Parliament, inquiries should take place as to the actual relation in which the Roman Catholic subjects of the Queen stand towards foreign powers and their own prelacy. I would advise that this subject should be fully investigated, the present anomalies of the law really exposed, and amendments of the law suggested for the consideration of Parliament; and though I know the difficulties of dealing with such a subject, I believe it would not be impracticable to introduce measures which should secure this country from the interference and usurpation of a foreign power, and at the same time should not take from, but add to, the religious freedom of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and place the Roman Catholic laity in a condition far more satisfactory to themselves than that in which they are at present—under the uncontrolled domination of the bishops and clergy of their Church. I feel, my lords, how greatly I ought to apologise for having detained you at this length. I have failed in the task which the favour of my Sovereign assigned me; but I have been placed in a position of great difficulty, as indeed difficulties exist on all sides, arising out of the three or four complicated questions to which I have alluded, that keep apart men between whom, upon other questions, there may be comparatively little difference of opinion. However little authority I may pretend to, I was anxious that my views should not be misinterpreted, and I trust your lordships will not think that I have unduly trespassed upon your time in making a full and frank declaration of the course of policy which, if I had been called to office, I should have ventured to recommend. I trust you will be of opinion that on the one hand I have not been unduly ambitious of power, and that, on the other hand, you will think that I have neither unduly shrunk from responsibility nor pertinaciously persevered in attempting to form a Government when I saw it was impracticable. And I hope, above all, that you will not see in any part of the course I have pursued anything which would be discreditably to my motives, or derogatory from that fair character which I hold to be the most inestimable possession of any statesman.

SPEECH OF SIR JAMES GRAHAM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—FEB. 28, 1851.

Sir J. GRAHAM, having been repeatedly called for, rose amid loud cheers, and said,—I wish to state why I waited for some intimation that the House expected from me some explanation before I—a private member—thought it consistent with my duty to intrude myself upon your notice on this occasion. I was afraid lest it might be deemed presumptuous in me, who have no official character whatever, to offer any observations on the present critical juncture of affairs, when an unguarded or imprudent expression might aggravate the difficulties which, from my heart, I wish to see removed rather than increased. But I regard what has just passed as an intimation that some explanation is expected from me, and I will endeavour to make that explanation as succinctly and as plainly as it is in my power to do. I hope the House will bear with me while I state as accurately as I can so much of the case as I can consistently with my duty, and without increasing the difficulties which have been stated to the House. On Saturday evening, as the noble lord has stated, Lord Aberdeen and I received the commands of her Majesty to wait upon her Majesty at Buckingham Palace; and there we were honoured with an audience of her Majesty, who informed us that Lord Stanley not being then prepared to form a Administration, she had empowered Lord John Russell to endeavour to reconstruct a Government; and her Majesty intimated to Lord Aberdeen and myself her command that, laying aside personal differences, we should meet Lord J. Russell in a spirit of amity and conciliation, for the purpose of seeing if it were possible to form a Government upon a more extended basis, with due regard to our private convictions of what was necessary for the public service. That command Lord Aberdeen and I cheerfully obeyed; and it is superfluous, I hope, for me to say that, having received such a command from the highest quarter in the realm, I should have been wanting in faithful obedience to my Sovereign—I should have been wanting in gratitude for the marks of condescension I had received from a Sovereign I had served for many years—knowing as I did, too, that the object nearest to the heart of that Sovereign was the welfare, contentment, and happiness of her people—I say I should have failed in my duty if I had not done my utmost to meet her injunction to act with the noble lord in the spirit of conciliation and friendship. The noble lord has used some expressions with regard to me for which I am most grateful. He said that, although the communications we had had lately had been abortive in bringing us into closer conjunction on public affairs, they had renewed the feelings of kindness which formerly existed between us in private life, and which it was most painful to him to think had ever been interrupted. I most cordially reciprocate every sentiment of kindness which the noble lord uttered; and with his permission I would gladly renew the cordiality of feeling which formerly so long existed between us. The noble lord and I have been contemporaries in public life for many years; we were at one time intimately associated in the bonds of kindness, I had almost said of affection, and I now beg to express a hope that I may be permitted again to call him in all

sincerity my noble friend. With respect to what the noble lord has said in relation to public affairs, I do not wish on the present occasion—although I must touch lightly upon some of the topics—to raise an adverse discussion, because probably the House will be of opinion with me that at the present juncture such a discussion would not be advisable. I will just touch upon the three leading points to which the noble lord referred; and upon these it is not to be thought that upon principle there could naturally be much difference of opinion between us. When the history of the past 30 years shall be recorded, there are three leading transactions which will fix the attention of the historian. I would say that the first is the cause of civil and religious liberty, as exhibited in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act and the emancipation of the Roman Catholics. The next is the extension of the suffrage, as manifested in the Reform Act; and the third is the establishment of a more liberal commercial and financial policy, which, for the sake of brevity, I will call free trade. These three transactions will be found to mark the history of the past 30 years; and upon all these questions, sometimes as his colleague and sometimes in opposition to him, it has been my good fortune to agree with the noble lord. When we come to the first question, what the noble lord said was this, “Shall we agree to free trade?” Why, upon this point there can be no difference of opinion between the noble lord and me. This was the policy which was transmitted to him by the late Sir Robert Peel; it was the policy I advocated as the colleague of Sir Robert Peel; and on a recent occasion, in the execution of what appeared to me to be a sacred duty and trust, I did my utmost to uphold that policy, giving ample credit to the Government of the noble lord for having, by a faithful exercise of power, done their utmost to uphold it likewise. Therefore, with respect to the future, I should say that upon every measure that was so shaped as to give effect to the extension of that principle there could be no doubt or difficulty that the noble lord and I could easily and naturally act together. Again, as regards the extension of the suffrage, the noble lord and I are, I believe, now the only surviving members of the committee of the Grey Cabinet to whom the preparation of the Reform Bill was referred. Upon principle, therefore, there could be no difficulty between the noble lord and me upon that subject. I agree with him that, so much having been conceded and so large an extension of popular privilege and democratic influence introduced into the constitution, it is necessary, in order that the balance of the constitution may be preserved and the existing form of government upheld, that there should be great caution in the next advance. Up to the present time, or at all events until recently, I thought there was safety in resisting any change whatever; but I am bound to say that, upon the whole, I am now not unwilling on principle to entertain the question of an extension of the franchise, guarding myself with the reserve, as I have already stated, that I can concede no extension which in my conscientious judgment I do not believe to be consistent with the maintenance and strengthening of the form of government under which we at present live. The noble lord said he had prepared an outline of a measure. I have not seen that outline; and, as in the preparation of a measure of this kind the utmost caution is necessary with respect to details, and as I have no knowledge of the details of the noble lord’s measure, and have had no share in its preparation, it would be rash in the extreme for me to pledge myself to support it. But again I say that to the principle of the extension of the suffrage, on my part, there could be no objection. It now remains for me to touch upon the last point—the question connected with the emancipation of the Catholics in 1829. And I am bound to say that, notwithstanding all that my noble friend has said with respect to his readiness to introduce modifications and extensive alterations in the bill now before the House, I cannot reconcile it to my sense of public duty to be a consenting party to that legislation. (Cheers from Irish members and others below the gangway on the Ministerial side.) That it has been found to involve extreme difficulty my noble friend has stated in what he has just addressed to the House. He says that, with all his anxious desire, in legislation of this description, not to affect the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion within the realm, having the ablest legal advice, having proceeded with the utmost caution, he has now, even since he has introduced his bill, reason to doubt whether the clauses, as now framed, do not interfere with the power of ordination, with collation to benefices in the Catholic Church, and even, as I understand him, with the enjoyment by bishops, and even parish priests in succession, of endowments destined for their support. Now, if my noble friend has really found such difficulty, with all his caution, in framing such a measure, it points out to me that I am justified in regarding—I had almost said with extreme dislike, and I cannot use a weaker term—legislation naturally involving consequences to which I so much object—legislation of which I believe that, if these objections be removed by the diminution of the measure, even so as to leave it for all practical purposes of any importance really inoperative, as it relates to the feelings of her Majesty’s Roman Catholic subjects within this realm, it will be regarded as penal and offensive, and will undo altogether the policy which for the last twenty or thirty years it has been the object of the best, the wisest, the greatest men of this country with difficulty to build up and to establish. It would not be expedient at present to involve the House in a debate upon this subject; to give effect to my opinion would require a greater enlargement on various topics than would be at all consistent with the view which I take of the public necessity on this occasion; but it is necessary for me to say that the opinion which I have formed with respect to this bill has not been formed hastily, and is not inconsistent with principles I have heretofore enunciated. Having for one moment thus rather glanced at the extent of my objections than the nature of them, it is necessary for me to proceed to the next point in what I have to state

to the House. I had no communication with Lord Aberdeen upon this subject until the first day of the session of Parliament, when, he having been in London, I arrived from the north. It so happened, that during his residence in Scotland, and mine in the north of England, for four months, we had not exchanged a letter. No correspondence has taken place upon the subject. With my habits of strict confidence and sincere friendship towards that noble lord, it was natural that, upon my arrival in London, before coming down to my place in Parliament, I should seek an interview with Lord Aberdeen; and I asked him what his opinion was upon this subject; and I found, to my very great joy, that his opinion was confirmatory of my own less perfect judgment, and that he entirely coincided with me. This difficulty, therefore, in regard to a junction with my noble friend (Lord J. Russell) on the part of Lord Aberdeen and myself was insuperable. The noble lord was willing to modify the bill, but he could not, with his conviction of what was due to the public good, consent to abandon it. Lord Aberdeen and I, on the other hand, viewing all the circumstances of the moment, seeing no imminent danger from abstaining from legislation, and seeing, as we did, the most serious dangers to be apprehended from persevering in this legislation before the House, said we could not be parties to it in even a more modified shape. This difficulty was fatal to our junction with the noble lord, and was insuperable; I believe agreement upon other points would not have been impossible, but this was a "cardinal" point, and the junction was impossible. Now observe, the objection to the junction was still more conclusive against any attempt on the part of Lord Aberdeen to form a Government; because I do not dissemble from myself, much less from the House, that the feeling of this country of Great Britain has been so excited that some legislation I believe really on the part of Government, however composed, would be required, though I have known nothing so dangerous in my experience in public affairs as the demand for something to be done without any reference to whether that something be safe or unsafe, practicable or impracticable. But three hundred and ninety-five members of this House, I think, in opposition to sixty-three, had voted in favour of the introduction of the bill; the feeling of the people of England and Scotland had been roused to the extreme, and evinced in county meetings and in every possible manner to be in unison with the view of her Majesty's late advisers, and quite opposed to the view taken by Lord Aberdeen and myself. We felt, therefore, that the attempt to conduct a Government framed on the principle of not legislating upon the subject in the present Parliament would have been abortive; and an appeal to the people under present circumstances, on a policy adverse to such legislation, would, I am afraid, have involved Great Britain in a struggle of the most calamitous kind. We at once, therefore, advised her Majesty that we could not undertake the responsibility of forming a Government on a principle which, I am bound to state, would not be consistent with the feeling of the great majority of the people of England out of doors. It will, perhaps, be said that this is an afterthought on my part, and more or less a subterfuge, to escape official responsibility. I wish to guard myself against any such misconception; and it does so happen, if the House will bear with me, I have irrefragable evidence to show that it is not the fact. In my own county of Cumberland, in November, a requisition was circulated for a county meeting. I have an intimate friend there, Mr. Howard of Greystoke Castle, descended from an ancient Roman Catholic family, first cousin of the Duke of Norfolk, the near relation of the Earl of Arundel; and he, entertaining an opinion different from mine, was of opinion that it was wise to call for a county meeting for the purpose of pressing for some legislation, in consequence of what is termed "the Papal aggression." I addressed to Mr. Howard on the 23rd of November a letter stating the reasons why I thought that course was inexpedient. I did not wish to aggravate the difficulties of her Majesty's Government, which I knew were extreme, because I am bound to say that a step such as that which has been taken by the Pope of Rome, and more especially by Cardinal Wiseman, was of a character so offensive—I must say more offensive because it was done with design and premeditation—that it was extremely difficult for any persons filling the offices which my noble friend and his colleagues then filled to allow such an insult to pass unnoticed. But, entertaining such objections to legislation, I thought it right, not approving of any interference such as Mr. Howard contemplated, in my answer to him, to enter somewhat at large into my reasons for that opinion; and, although I am extremely unwilling to trouble the House with it, yet, if they will bear with me, I will read that part of my letter which refers to this subject, having Mr. Howard's permission so to do. It is couched in these terms:—

"Netherby, Nov. 23, 1850.

"It would give me cordial satisfaction to co-operate with you on any public occasion in this county. But, although I am a sincere Protestant, and resent the haughty tone assumed by the Pope in his bull, and by Cardinal Wiseman in his pastoral letter, yet I am unwilling to join in the No-Popery cry, or to ask for the revival of penal laws or for any new enactment which might fetter the Roman Catholics in the full and proper exercise of their religious discipline within the realm. When I supported emancipation I knew that the Roman Catholics acknowledged Papal supremacy, and would be guided in all spiritual matters by bulls from Rome. I knew, also, that their religion is episcopal; and when I fought on their side for perfect equality of civil rights I was aware that the Pope might nominate in England, as in Ireland, archbishops and bishops. I did not attach much importance to the safeguard proposed by the Duke of Wellington, who did not himself place much reliance on it, that the Popish hierarchy so nominated should not assume the title of English or Irish sees occupied by Protestant prelates. I myself was a party to the recognition by statute of the dignity of Roman Catholic

archbishops and bishops in Ireland; while I adhered, however, to the settlement of 1829, that the enactment prohibiting the assumption of local episcopal titles identical with Protestant sees should be withheld, I proposed in the House of Commons, on behalf of Sir Robert Peel's Government, the remission of the penalties which attached to receiving bulls or other similar instruments from Rome; and out of office I supported Lord John Russell's measure, which authorises the renewal of diplomatic intercourse with the Roman Pontiff. I took these steps deliberately, and I do not regret them. I believe them to have been necessary for the good government of Ireland, and I cannot believe that it will be possible to have one law for England and another for Ireland with respect to Roman Catholic discipline and worship."

I might have added—which I omitted here—that on the part of Sir R. Peel's Government I moved for the endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth—a measure which I am bound to say, in my humble belief, shook the foundations of the strength of Sir R. Peel's Government, but which nevertheless I believe to have been a debt in justice due to the people of Ireland, and which, whatever may have been its effects, is a measure I never can regret. Further, I was the organ of Sir R. Peel's Government in moving the Bequests Act, an act which recognised the authority (as we understood) of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy of Ireland. It speaks of the Roman Catholic archbishop or bishop "officiating in any district," and Roman Catholic clergymen "having pastoral superintendence of any congregation." What is the meaning of "officiating in any district" but having a diocese? What is the meaning of "having pastoral superintendence of a congregation" but being a parish priest? And what does that act do? It carefully gives to them in succession the benefit of charitable bequests made in trust for them. But I will proceed with my letter:—

"I am offended, indeed, by the arrogance and folly of the language which the Pope and his cardinal have thought fit to employ in announcing an ecclesiastical arrangement which I believe to be lawful, and which I do not consider dangerous. But my displeasure will not induce me to treat with disrespect the religion of 7,000,000 of my countrymen, or to contemplate for one moment the revision or the reversal of a policy which, in defiance of the No-Popery cry, I have supported throughout my public life, which I still believe to be sound, and which is indispensable, unless by a melancholy necessity the vast majority of the Irish people are still to be treated and considered as our national enemies. I have thus written to you without reserve my genuine sentiments. I am aware they are not popular. I do not wish to obtrude them on public attention. The subject will, in some shape, probably be brought under the notice of the House of Commons; and then, in my place in Parliament, it may be my duty to declare the feelings and the opinions which I entertain. In the mean time I am desirous to avoid any premature or hasty pledge in a matter of such paramount importance. I am more anxious to extinguish them than to add fuel to the flame of religious strife and animosity."

I put those opinions and feelings upon record on the 23rd of November. I avoided giving undue publicity to them, because I was honestly of opinion that it would add to the difficulty of a moment full of difficulty without any such addition. I, however, did not conceal them. They were not unknown in quarters where they might have produced some effect. But, having put those opinions upon record, I appeal to the House—I appeal to the country—whether it was possible for me, entertaining deeply the conviction of the truth of these sentiments, either to be a party to the further progress of legislation to which the conviction of my noble friend is pledged, or to think of forming part of a new Administration based upon a pledge to introduce such legislation. I know, if I were seeking popular power through such means, I should have abstained from this course; I know the ground I take is an unpopular ground; but what I have expressed is a conviction I strongly and deeply entertain. I am afraid, if you commence this, step by step you will be dragged into the penal legislation which broke down under you in 1829, which brought matters to such a dreadful alternative that the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, without acknowledging a change of opinion, yet from the necessity of the case, admitted that a change of policy was indispensable. Thanking the House for their kind indulgence, I have nothing more now to add; when the question of the second reading of this bill comes before the House I shall venture to offer some observations upon it.

CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN IRELAND.

Merrion-square, February 22nd, 1851.

SIR,—I have read, with some attention, "A bill prepared and brought in by Lord John Russell, Sir George Grey, and Mr. Attorney-General Romilly, to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." At this stage of that bill, it may be useful to place before the public a plain statement of its practical effects. In considering the measure, the supposed occasion for it, and its future consequences, it will be quite necessary to bear in mind that the United Kingdom consists of three distinct parts—England, Ireland, and Scotland.

The preamble of the bill refers to the 24th section of the Roman Catholic Relief Act (10th Geo. IV., c. 7), and then proceeds to make three statements with respect to that prohibitory enactment. Of those three statements, two are untrue in point of law, and the third is untrue in point of fact.

Firstly—The preamble asserts that—"It may be *doubted* whether the enactment extends to the assumption of the title of archbishop or bishop of a pretended province or diocese, or of a city, place, or territory in England or Ireland, not being the see, province, or diocese of

Secondly—The preamble asserts that—“The attempt to establish, under colour of authority from the See of Rome or otherwise, such pretended sees, provinces, or dioceses, is *illegal* and void.”

Thirdly—The preamble asserts that—“The assumption of such ecclesiastical titles is inconsistent with the rights *intended* to be protected by the said enactment.”

With regard to the first and the second of these three assertions, it may suffice to refer to the following passage, extracted *verbatim* from the *Times* report of the speech made by Lord John Russell when moving to introduce the bill:—

“The opinion given by the law officers of the Crown to the Government was that, with regard to the assumption of the particular titles assumed, and with reference to the present state of the law and the existing statutes, they did not think that either by the common law or by the statute law the assumption of those titles was *illegal*, or that those persons who assumed them could be prosecuted with effect.”

In truth, there is *no doubt* whatever that the prohibitory clause in the Relief Act does *not* extend to the cases mentioned in the preamble of the proposed bill; and it is equally free from doubt that, according to the existing law, the attempt to establish, or even the actual establishment, of such pretended sees, provinces, or dioceses, is *not illegal*, although it may be legally void, as being ignored by the law. The assertion contained in the preamble of the proposed bill, to the effect that such an attempt is *illegal*, flatly contradicts the opinion given by the law officers of the Crown to Lord John Russell.

The third assertion in the preamble of the bill relates to the extent of protection *intended* to have been afforded by the Relief Act to existing rights and titles. It is sufficiently plain from the words of the Relief Act, that the proposers of that measure, and the Legislature itself, could have *intended* only to protect “the right and title of archbishops to *their* provinces, of bishops to *their* sees, and of deans to *their* deaneries,” against being assumed or used by any other persons than the archbishops, bishops, and deans of the Established Church authorised by law to assume such titles.

But any doubt with regard to the extent of protection *intended* by the proposers of the Relief Bill is at once removed by referring to the reported speeches. Lord John Russell, when bringing in his present bill, quotes from the speech made by Sir Robert Peel, in 1829, several passages, which show very plainly that it was not then *intended* to prevent the assumption of episcopal titles derived from sees, provinces, or dioceses not used by bishops of the Established Church.

The following is one of the passages cited by Lord John Russell from the speech made in 1829 by Sir Robert Peel, when introducing the Relief Bill:—“I propose that the episcopal titles and names made use of in the Church of England shall not be assumed by bishops of the Roman Catholic Church.”

It is well known that when the Relief Bill was passing through the House of Commons a distinct proposition was made to render the 24th section more stringent, by making it applicable to the very case to which the present bill now asserts it was then intended that section should apply. But this proposition was then deliberately rejected. Upon the recent debate the House was reminded of the proposition so made in 1829.

From these simple statements, it clearly appears that the foundation of the proposed bill rests upon three assertions, of law or of fact, which are undoubtedly contrary to the truth. It is not becoming in any Government to call upon members of the Legislature to affirm statements which are false. The proposers of the bill should, therefore, either expunge those untrue assertions, or should so alter the preamble as to be conformable with law and fact. Such alterations could only be effected by substituting statements directly contradictory to those made in the present preamble to the proposed bill.

The bill being thus founded upon a false basis—a house built upon sand—i^t proceeds to erect upon that basis four enacting clauses. The legal and practical effects of these clauses, with respect to England, Ireland, and Scotland, may be thus fairly stated:—

1—In England, all Catholic archbishops, bishops, and deans will be prevented from assuming or using any name, style, or title taken from any city, town, place, territory, or district, within the United Kingdom.

2—The same prohibition applies to all Catholic archbishops, bishops, and deans in Ireland.

3—The same prohibition likewise applies to all archbishops, bishops, and deans of the Episcopalian Protestants in Scotland.

Considering the false construction which the preamble of this bill now proposed to place upon the Relief Act, in connexion with the very extensive phraseology used in the third section of the bill, it may be most seriously doubted whether the Catholic vicars apostolic of Scotland do not also fall within the terms of the prohibition; for although a vicar apostolic possesses a formal name taken from some obscure foreign town, he is known to the public and to his flock only by the more substantial designation derived from the episcopal district over which he presides.

According to this very probable construction of the bill it would effect not merely its more obvious object of suppressing the old Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, as well as that of England, but it would also, in a less obvious manner, prohibit all vicars apostolic, and thus, “in the most quiet manner possible,” effectually abolish or render illegal every form of episcopal Church government for Catholics in any part of the United Kingdom.

The *Times* report of the speech made by Sir John Romilly, in support of the bill, represents

that gentleman as having stated to the House, "It had been said that the bill would not interfere with the synodical action of the Roman Catholic prelates; but he differed from that opinion, and thought it would be the necessary consequence of the bill that this action would be interfered with. It was desirable to effect that object in the most quiet manner possible; but if it was effectually done it was all the House should seek to do, and they should rest content with provisions suited to the occasion."

According to the *Globe* version of that speech, Sir John Romilly said:—"I attack the territorial title because the present constitution of the Roman Church makes such a title necessary to the ecclesiastical exercise of the episcopal office. Therefore, by protecting the former, I effectually stop every evil that can follow on the latter."

From these passages it would seem to follow that the object and intention, as well as the legal effect of the bill, is to render it illegal for any person to exercise the office of archbishop, bishop, or dean within the United Kingdom, unless as a Protestant archbishop, bishop, or dean, established by law.

4—The phrasology of the third section is ingeniously interwoven.

Its simple effects are, that under pain of absolute forfeiture it will prospectively prevent all future gifts for the support of any Catholic archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery in England, Ireland, or Scotland, or of any Protestant archbishopric, bishopric or deanery in Scotland.

5—It will also have a retrospective operation; and read in connexion with the second section, will in effect prevent or greatly embarrass the future disposition of property heretofore lawfully given for the support of any such archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery.

It will follow from these two last propositions that all Catholic archbishoprics, bishoprics, and deaneries in the United Kingdom, and all Protestant archbishoprics, bishoprics, and deaneries in Scotland, must soon remain *wholly unendowed*. The result will be precisely the same, whether the ecclesiastical government shall be administered through a regular hierarchy or through vicars apostolic. The only mode to comply with or evade this section will be to vest the property absolutely in some person, without any written or even any verbal direction that he shall hold it as a trustee for the support of the archbishop, bishop, or dean, and upon the chance that he will not afterwards think proper to appropriate it to his own private use; for, under the 4th section, he can be compelled "to answer upon oath as to any secret or other trust, or other matter whatsoever."

The consequence is apparent, that all property intended for the support of any person exercising episcopal jurisdiction over any Catholics in the United Kingdom, or over any Protestants in Scotland, must be given to him absolutely either in his private capacity or under some foreign title, such as Bishop of Ephesus, in Asia Minor; or of Loretto, in the Roman territory; or of the recently-created Emmett district, or O'Brien district, in Iowa, in the United States. It is easy to foresee the many inconveniences which must arise from such a state of the law, and that it must either end in its being repealed, or in great private as well as public mischiefs.

6—The third section will also, in effect, absolutely prohibit each prudent Catholic in England, Ireland, or Scotland, and each sensible Protestant in Scotland, from naming as his trustee or executor for any public or charitable, or even private purpose, any person who may happen to fill the character of archbishop, bishop, or dean of his own Church.

This will be the only safe mode to comply with the provisions of a complicated section, which may come to be construed hereafter by an astute, or perhaps an adverse tribunal. All future trusts vested in any person filling the rank of Catholic archbishop, bishop, or dean in England, Ireland, or Scotland, or of Protestant archbishop, bishop, or dean in Scotland; or of any chaplain, or other subordinate of any such dignity, will be subject to the risk of an immediate forfeiture. Even should co-trustees be named, the property will become absolutely vested in the Crown, without any office or inquisition found, to be disposed of as the Prime Minister of that day, or of any future day, shall be pleased to direct.

In the meantime, the titles of many estates will become comparatively insecure, and will be held in fear and trembling by their Catholic owners or Protestant transferees.

7—A further retrospective effect of the second and third sections will be to prevent or greatly embarrass the future disposition of any property heretofore legally vested in any Catholic archbishop, bishop, or dean of England, Ireland, or Scotland, and of any Protestant archbishop, bishop, or dean of Scotland.

It is unnecessary here to point out the unjust interference which would take place with the Irish Charitable Bequests' Act, the Dublin Cemeteries' Act, and other statutes and public and private documents under which particular properties are at present lawfully vested in different members of the Irish Catholic hierarchy by names taken from their dioceses in Ireland.

Those who may not have carefully considered the different clauses of the proposed measure will perhaps suppose that I have given an exaggerated representation of their practical operation. But such is not the case. On the contrary, it is easy to conceive that a prejudiced judge might often consider it his conscientious duty to construe the proposed act as including cases to which I have not contemplated that it can be intended to apply. Although a measure of the most penal character it would probably, be construed hereafter by some upright judges as a remedial act designed in the great wisdom of our Legislature to repress, as admitted evils, all archbishops, bishops, and deans in England, Ireland, or Scotland, not belonging to the Church established by law, and as extending to deprive them perforce of all tangible property within these realms, held by them upon trust either for their personal support or for charitable purposes.

In some cases which might be suggested it would task the ability of a practised lawyer so to dispose of property for spiritual or for charitable purposes as to satisfy even an impartial judge, but it would often be impossible to escape the mischievous ingenuity of a prejudiced tribunal.

Some persons may suggest that, even should Catholic property become vested in the Crown, it is not probable that any unfair advantage would be taken of the forfeiture. But this is a condition of abject dependance upon the caprices of a Protestant Prime Minister not proper to be imposed upon the members of any religion which the State does not endow, and which the laws have hitherto almost ignored for any purposes save those of disqualification and penal enactments.

If the novel, and forced, and false constructions which the preamble of the present bill now proposes to place on the Relief Act of 1829 can be regarded as any test of the extended constructions which may hereafter be placed upon that bill in some years after it shall have become law, it would be hardly possible to exaggerate the mischiefs that might ensue. And without wishing to excite any groundless alarm at the present time, it is right to suggest that it may hereafter be found absolutely necessary to conduct the old Catholic hierarchy of Ireland upon a secret system—concealing for a time the true titles of their dignitaries, and transferring all their means of support and charitable funds into the funds of foreign States.

Should that most unfortunate state of affairs ever arise, it will then become an easy matter for the Prime Minister of that day to decide whether a person having no ostensible title, but possessing a secret spiritual government over a concealed archdiocese of Dublin, and deriving all the means to support himself and his charities from French or American funds, will be more likely to be a loyal and devoted subject of the British Crown than is the present Catholic Archbishop of Dublin with his public title derived from his old Irish see, and supporting himself and those charities which he administers out of properties within the United Kingdom. It would be easy to understand the sound policy of a law passed for the purpose of prohibiting any subjects of her Majesty from exercising even a spiritual government within her dominions under titles derived from foreign territories or towns; but it is difficult to comprehend the wisdom of a measure calculated to compel the spiritual superiors of a numerous section of her people to govern their flocks under titles assumed from places outside her realms.

There is, perhaps, but one satisfactory view that may be taken of the proposed bill. It is of so unjust a character, is so direct a violation of the religious liberties and the civil rights of one-third of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, and so fraught with consequences injurious to the best interests of the whole empire, that it will either never become law, or must speedily be repealed.

The proposed legislation goes so far beyond the supposed occasion, and leads to such disastrous results, that it may be seriously doubted whether its proposers, when they presented it to Parliament, were fully conscious of its real effects. Judging from the speeches delivered by Lord John Russell and Sir John Romilly, it would appear probable that neither of them had read the bill before it was introduced. It is sufficiently evident that they had not studied or understood its provisions. It may, therefore, be anticipated that when, in common with the public, they shall have had the opportunity to consider it more fully and in detail, they will either alter it in all material respects, or abandon it altogether, and substitute for it some parliamentary declaration equal in their opinion to the supposed occasion. This anticipation is grounded upon contrasting the introductory speeches with the bill as now introduced. In those speeches it was distinctly asserted that the bill should not go beyond the supposed occasion for it.

Upon the opening of Parliament on the 4th February, 1851, Lord John Russell complained in very strong language of the recent constitution of a Catholic hierarchy in England, but added—

“I shall not introduce measures which go beyond the occasion, or which will in any way trench on what I think due to the religious liberty of all classes of her Majesty’s subjects.”

Sir John Romilly (Attorney-General), when speaking in support of the motion for permission to introduce the bill, deprecated any discussion upon it in the absence of all knowledge of its provisions, and stated that—

“He hoped the House would permit him to call attention to what was the offence which it was intended by this bill to meet. The offence consisted in the introduction of a bull in the course of last year by which certain persons were entitled by the Pope to assume certain territorial sees and dioceses defined by certain limits. That was the whole extent of the offence. The view he took, which was one he thought the House would agree in, was, that in meeting these consequences you should act on a very sound and safe maxim of politics, and that you ought not to introduce a remedy more extensive than was necessary to meet the evil complained of. He thought, therefore, if they introduced and passed a measure which should effectually prevent a person from holding these sees as being bishops or archbishops of those pretended dioceses in *England*, that the real object which was sought would be found, and that they needed not to legislate beyond the occasion.”

He added, that :—“He was well assured the bill had been framed with considerable care to meet that object. It would be for the House to consider with what success.”

From these passages it plainly appears that the whole extent of the supposed offence consisted in the introduction of a Papal bull, or letters apostolical, into England in the course of last year, entitling certain persons to assume territorial sees and dioceses; in fact, substituting a regular Catholic hierarchy in England for the former vicars apostolic. It

appears also that a measure effectually preventing persons from holding those sees, as being bishops or archbishops of those dioceses in *England*, would fully attain the real object, and that any further or more extensive or more stringent legislation against the Catholic Church, or Church property in England, would go beyond the occasion; and that any interference whatever with the Church government or property of Catholics in Ireland, or in Scotland, or of Episcopalian Protestants in Scotland, would be wholly inexcusable and uncalled for.

The most superficial reference to the bill itself will at once show that even for England—as to which country alone the supposed offence is said to have arisen—the proposed legislation goes infinitely beyond the alleged occasion. Those practical effects enumerated above will suffice to exhibit some portions of the gross injustice which will be done towards all Catholics in each of the three kingdoms, and also towards the Episcopalian Protestants of Scotland, by depriving them of their Church government, and of their property—or, in other words, of their religious liberty and civil rights.

Were it the sole object of the Government to introduce a measure confined to the supposed occasion, it would not have been difficult to frame a bill which should render illegal the establishment of a Catholic hierarchy in England, and thus raise fairly the simple question called by the name of “Papal aggression,” which is said to arise upon the letters apostolical dated the 29th of September, and on the pastoral of Cardinal Wiseman, dated the 7th of October last.

This is not the proper place to discuss either the substance or the form of those documents, or whether any insult whatever was offered, or intended to have been offered, by them. It is sufficient to state that under no aspect can they form any sort of excuse for a legislative aggression upon the religious liberty, or the civil rights, of the Episcopalian Protestants of Scotland, or of the Catholics of Scotland, or of Ireland. Even had his Holiness the Pope, or his Eminence the Cardinal, used insulting, or improper, or inappropriate language in documents relating to the Catholics of England, that impropriety would form no just reason for visiting with aggressive legislation the Catholics of England, and still less the Catholics of Ireland, or of Scotland, or the Episcopalian Protestants of Scotland.

Nor will it be any sort of justification for depriving the Roman Catholic people of any portion of their religious liberty or civil rights that the Protestant bishops of Scotland may possibly not complain that they and their flocks shall suffer for a time under a religious persecution, from which they may, perhaps, calculate upon a speedy exemption, and that its permanent character will eventually be confined to Catholics alone.

But this bill, which in its terms is common to the three countries, will assuredly occasion evils in Catholic Ireland, one hundred-fold greater than even those which are likely to arise in Protestant England or in Presbyterian Scotland.

It will endeavour to accomplish the abolition of that old Catholic hierarchy which has subsisted without interruption in the land of Ireland for a period exceeding 1,400 years, and ever since the first introduction of Christianity into the island. It will tend to revive religious animosities, and to again disturb the entire country.

It will constitute a Californian capital for the political agitator, and will distract all Irishmen from that close attention which they had begun to give to their material interests, and which their country so imperatively requires at the present time.

At what future period all these evils shall have their final end no living man can pretend to foresee. But all Irishmen, be they Protestant or be they Catholic, may rest most fully assured that the ultimate conclusion of the tragedy or of the farce will be that which may at the time be considered most beneficial or most agreeable to the people of England alone—whether that conclusion shall commence with a renewal of bitter persecutions against the Catholics of Ireland, or with an appropriation to public uses of all the temporalities of the Irish Protestant Church.—Your’s, &c.,

VINCENT SCULLY.

THE IRISH CATHOLIC PRELATES AND THE “PENAL LAWS.”

The following address of the Roman Catholic prelates to their beloved flocks upon the penal enactments with which the Catholics of England and Ireland are threatened appeared in the hierarchy, twenty-eight in number :—

“Dearly beloved Brethren,—The approach of a season of trial and tribulation naturally calls forth the admonitions of a voice that has never been absent from you in the hour of suffering and sorrow. Though you are familiar with its accents, and confiding in its assurances, we feel that it will demand no ordinary exercise of the docility and obedience which you have always rendered to its instructions to receive, in the spirit of patience and conformity to the Divine will, the last and bitter ingredient which is now about to be poured into the cup of your afflictions. It is unnecessary to state that we allude to the penal enactment against the Catholics of the three kingdoms that occupies at present the attention of the Legislature. And yet, in reference to the persecution of which this measure is to be the instrument, as well as to the other sufferings destined for the Church, may we not address you in the language of the Prince of the Apostles to the early Christians—‘Dearly beloved, think not strange the burning heat that is to try you, as if some new thing happened to you; but if you partake of the sufferings of Christ, rejoice that when his glory shall be revealed you may also be glad with exceeding joy.’ (1 Peter, iv.) The sufferings thus inflicted, he tells you, are necessary in order that ‘the trial of your faith (much more precious than gold which is tried by the fire) may be found unto praise, and glory, and honour, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.’

(1 Peter i., 7.) Nor is the exhortation of St. Paul on this subject, recalling, as it does, the touching reminiscences of the past, less appropriate and applicable to you in the present emergency:—‘Call to mind the former days wherein, being illuminated, you endured a great fight of afflictions. Do not, therefore, lose your confidence, which hath a great reward. For patience is necessary for you, that doing the will of God you may receive the promise.’ (Hebrews x., 32, 36.)

“We deem it better, dearly beloved brethren, thus early to prepare you for the magnitude of the trial with which our holy Church is menaced, both in England and Ireland, than to seek to conceal and palliate its real character. The object and tendency of the measure before Parliament at present will be put in its true light by an eminent lawyer whom we have consulted on this matter, whose legal opinion we publish as an appendix to this address. For us, suffice it to say that the measure we are treating of tends to annoy, disorganise, and crush the Catholic hierarchy; to annul its acts of jurisdiction; to fetter and impede, as much as possible, the exercise of that ministry by which the truths of revelation are proclaimed, and the mysteries and sacraments of religion imparted; and grievously to injure, if not to destroy, those noble charitable institutions which are the glory and the blessing of the land, and which are maintained, as they have been established, by the free offerings of the faithful. The blighting effects of this penal law, if adopted, will be felt by the orphan that is now sheltered in the bosom of Catholic benevolence, and by the destitute sufferer on his death bed, whose pangs are so often soothed by the devoted daughter of charity, while they are consoled by the Christian ministry that has called those institutions into existence—by the power of that kindling and creative word which it has been commissioned to preach.

“Nor are the grounds on which this measure has been proposed more in accordance with truth than its objects are with justice and humanity. We need scarcely remind you, dearly beloved brethren, that what has given rise to the proposed enactment against us is the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England. Our beloved father, the Pope, desirous to promote the spiritual welfare of his Catholic children in that kingdom—to give them increased means of spiritual instruction—to enable them to make greater progress in every virtue, and to afford more abundant opportunities of providing for the eternal salvation of their souls, determined to give them a number of pastors more proportionate to their wants, and therefore appointed an archbishop and several bishops with ordinary jurisdiction. As supreme pastor of the flock, appointed by Jesus Christ, in the person of St. Peter, to feed His lambs and sheep, both pastors and people, he had a fully recognised divine right to do so—a right essential to his office, a right without which he could not maintain his authority over the universal Church of Christ. We need not tell you, dearly beloved brethren, that the Roman Pontiffs, from the earliest ages, and in the times of the most cruel persecutions, exercised this authority to its fullest extent, and that all the Churches of these kingdoms owe their establishment to its acts. The episcopal sees of Ireland can trace back their origin to St. Patrick, who was sent to this country by the Holy Pontiff St. Celestine, and it is our glory to be able to state that the chain of the apostolical succession has not been broken since that time in our portion of the Catholic Church. The principal Churches of England were founded by St. Augustine and his companions, sent by St. Gregory the Great to bring the glad tidings of salvation to a nation that was then sitting in darkness and the shades of death. It was in virtue of his primacy over all the Churches that the Pope exercised his right, and of that supremacy which made one of the most ancient fathers, St. Irenæus, assert—‘that every Church, and all the faithful, should have recourse to the Roman Church, on account of her greater principality;’ and induced St. Cyprian to consider ‘the chair of Peter as the principal Church, from which the unity of the priesthood has arisen, and to which perfidy cannot have access.’—59, ‘*Ad Petri cathedram, atque ad ecclesiam principem, ad quam perfidia non possit habere accessum.*’

“But while exercising a purely spiritual authority for spiritual purposes—for the promotion of God’s kingdom on earth, for the more ready administration of the sacraments, for the salvation of souls—we can assure you, dearly beloved brethren, that the Pontiff made no aggression on any one’s authority; that he did not interfere, directly or indirectly, with the administration of the temporal affairs of this kingdom; that he did not in the remotest manner insult the Crown or diminish its privileges; and, we may add, that he did not in the slightest degree intrench on the authority, the revenues, or the territorial possessions of other religious institutions. If an outcry has been raised against his Holiness, it is not on account of any usurpation or aggression on his part; it must have arisen from a misapprehension of the nature of his acts, or it must be allowed that it is directed to impede the exercise of that divine and indefeasible jurisdiction which all Catholics are bound to acknowledge in the successor of St. Peter, and the acts of which they must admit unless they wish to incur the guilt of schism.

“As one of the effects of the penal measure now pending over us would be to separate the faithful from the supreme head of the Church, so also another consequence would be to sever the priesthood from the people. Do not allow yourselves to be persuaded that this would not be a serious injury to religion. Would not the flock be necessarily scattered if the pastors were smitten? If the branches of the vine were torn from the parent trunk, would they not necessarily wither? If separated from its head, would not the mystical body immediately languish and decay? There may be other religious establishments which require no such unity between the pastors and their flocks—which, stripped of a sacrifice and almost of sacraments, and giving unbounded liberty to the interpretation of doctrine, demand little more than a no-

minimal exercise of the ministerial functions; but in the Catholic Church the action of the priesthood is the vivifying principle which gives life and energy to the entire body—that follows the faithful from the cradle to the grave—from the sacrament that gives admission to the Church to that which soothes and fortifies against the pangs and terrors of death—that watches with assiduous care over the sacred deposit of faith, and preserves it from the contagion of error. To destroy that principle, therefore, or impede its action, is to inflict a fatal or dangerous wound on the body itself.

“Having briefly pointed out to you the real nature of this penal enactment with which we are menaced, and the substantial injuries which it embodies, we implore of you, dearly beloved brethren, to adopt the best and surest means of defeating it—namely, the fulfilment of all your duties, loyalty to the Crown, obedience to the constituted authorities, moderation, patience, and, above all, a fervent recourse by prayer to the throne of the Most High, who bends the hearts of princes, and has in His hands the destinies of nations. Implore of Him to preserve His Church, to guard His chaste spouse, and to put to nought the designs of those who would enslave her. Let us cry out in the fulness of our affliction, ‘Turn, O God of Hosts; look down from heaven and see and visit this vineyard’ (Psalms, 79). Do not allow ‘the boar out of the wood to lay it waste, nor the wild beast to devour it’ (Psalms, 79). Inspire those that would excite the spirit of bigotry and intolerance against us with better counsels, and do not permit them to incur your indignation. ‘Give us help from trouble, for vain is the salvation of man’ (Psalms, 59).

“But whilst we exhort you to have recourse to Heaven in your afflictions, we are not to be understood as if we condemned the peaceful exertion of those legal and constitutional rights for the redress of political wrongs and injuries which are the birthright of every British subject. It is not, however, necessary to make any suggestion on this matter to you, as we perceive that you have already commenced to petition Parliament, and to take other legal steps to resist the encroachment on the liberties of the Church with which we are threatened. Instructed by you, those who represent you in Parliament will not only assert the independence and freedom of your religion both in England and Ireland (for the interests of the Catholic body are the same in both countries), but they will insist that Catholics shall be put and maintained on a footing of perfect equality with all the other subjects of the Crown, and that every remnant of persecution shall be obliterated. We ask for nothing but what is conceded to others, and we cannot be content with less than the full and free right to practise our religion in conformity to its doctrines and discipline. Nor can we doubt that while defending your rights as Catholics, you will be promoting the interests of the empire at large; for it cannot be in accordance with justice or humanity to deprive so many millions of faithful subjects, guilty of no offence, of their lawful rights; nor can it contribute to the stability and welfare of the country to excite discord and bad feeling among those whose interests should be common; nor can it ever tend to encourage public morality to enact laws which it must be the conscientious duty of millions to evade.

“But while exerting yourselves to impede an unjust measure, recollect that the man who outrages the peace of society and violates the law not only offends against the moral code, but grievously injures the cause that he supports, and strengthens the hands of his enemies. Based upon the eternal principles of truth and equity, the cause with which you are identified cannot fail to succeed, when advocated by means which are consonant to its justice and holiness, and such, dearly beloved brethren, are the only means which we feel convinced you are disposed to employ.

“Whatever temporary tribulation the Church may have to endure—whatever combats to sustain—her ultimate success and triumph are placed beyond the possibility of doubt. We can appeal to the experience of 18 centuries. The powers of earth, the wisdom of Greece and Rome, error, heresy, schism, infidelity, have been successively leagued against her; like her Divine Master, she has been placed as a sign to be contradicted; but, while all human institutions have fallen away around her, and disappeared, she has always continued her beneficent career, ever triumphant over the assaults of her enemies, ever fresh in the vigour of youth, ever unchanged. How vividly has the Royal prophet predicted her destiny in her great type of the elder covenant!—‘Often have they fought against me from my youth, let Israel now say. Often have they fought against me from my youth, but they could not prevail over me’ (Ps. 128.). And every day bears testimony to the truth of the fire-touched lips that said of her—‘No weapon that is forged against her shall prosper, and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. The children of them that afflict thee shall come bowing down to thee, and all that slandered thee shall worship the steps of thy feet, and shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.’—Isaiah lx. 14.

“Fortified by these glorious predictions, and still more by the most consoling promises of our Divine Redeemer, that ‘the gates of hell shall never prevail against His Church,’ and that ‘He will be with her all days, even to the consummation of the world,’ we exhort you with the apostle, dearly beloved, to bear your trials with patience and resignation, and ‘not to lose your confidence, which hath a great reward.’ ‘Wherefore lift up the heads which hang down and the feeble knees, and make straight steps with your feet, that no one halting may go out of the way, but rather be healed. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see God.’ ‘But may the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great pastor of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, in the blood of the everlasting testament, fit you in all goodness, that you may do His will, doing in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom is glory for ever and ever, Amen.’ (Hebrews, x., 12, 13.)

MR. SERJEANT SHEE'S SPEECH

AT THE MEETING AT THE FREEMASONS' TAVERN, MARCH 8, 1851.

Mr. Serjeant SHEE, on moving the resolution—"That our obedience and reverence to his Holiness the Pope and to our bishops are purely spiritual, and in no wise interfere with our allegiance and duty to our Sovereign; and that whilst we yield to none in the sincerest loyalty to our Sovereign, we claim as an undoubted right the free exercise of our religion, including therein the free appointment of our ministers, and the regular constitution of our Church according to its laws and customs," said: The resolution consisted of two propositions, the first of which was so familiar to every one who had the advantage of a Catholic education, that he deemed it unnecessary to trespass on their attention by any argument to urge its adoption; and he was less inclined to do so, knowing that other gentlemen had resolutions to propose, because he found in the journals of that morning, which by the next day would be circulated in every part of the United Kingdom, a plain and distinct explanation of the allegiance they owed to their Sovereign, and of its perfect consistency with the spiritual obedience which they paid to the Head of the Church. In the second part of the resolution, they were called upon to assert their right to the free exercise of their religion, including therein the free appointment of its ministers, and the regular constitution of their Church, according to its laws and customs. This second part brought him at once to the main business which had caused them to assemble there to-day; but before he adverted particularly to the bill against which they were met to protest, he might be permitted to remind them that the last time they met in that hall, they assembled to express their gratitude to an illustrious statesman, who, despising the violence of interested clamour, and regardless of all considerations but his duty to his Sovereign and her people, had just proposed to Parliament a large addition to the State endowment of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth. It might be said of that distinguished statesman, as had been said by a great orator of antiquity, in reference to the death of a statesman of his own time, "Fuit hoc acerbum patrie, grave bonis omnibus;" but to no class of his fellow-subjects was the misfortune which deprived his country of his services so truly mournful and so calamitous as it was to them. Sir Robert Peel had been chosen, at his entrance into political life, more than forty years ago, to be the champion of the Protestant Established Church of these realms, and during that long parliamentary career, he had proved himself on all occasions the watchful guardian of her rights and interests; but he had learned also the impossibility of maintaining the system of the pigny Ministers upon whom the mantle of the great Pitt unfortunately fell, and the necessity of admitting the religion of 10,000,000 of the Queen's loyal subjects in England and Ireland within the pale of the conservative policy of the State. He well remembered on that occasion being called upon by the noble lord who was then in the chair to address the meeting, expressing the satisfaction which he felt in being a party to paying a tribute of gratitude to the honesty and courage of Sir Robert Peel; but he could not help also declaring his opinion that their thanks were due to one who, in good and bad times, through good and evil report, had proved himself their steadfast friend, and that they ought not to separate without tendering their thanks also to Lord John Russell, and to the great party then in opposition, of which he was the acknowledged leader. That meeting agreed with him in opinion; but little did they think that in a few short years from that time the noble lord would stoop to unloose his reputation, and spend his rich opinion by reviving the calumnies against their creed which had disgraced the reign of the Percivals and the Eldons, or that he would seek to expiate the services he had performed in the cause of civil and religious liberty by appearing as a mourner at their tombs. However, so it had happened. Had it not been for the opportune arrival of the faithful representatives of the Irish people to their rescue, there would have attached to the name of Russell the ignominy of having been the author of a new law, to be called, no doubt, Lord John Russell's Act, for the religious persecution of the Catholics of England and Ireland, and the confiscation of their property. Thanks to the assistance they had received, they had been saved the infliction of the bill proposed by Lord John Russell and the Attorney General to the House of Commons. It had been cut down from a bill for the confiscation of Roman Catholic charities to a bill for the degradation and humiliation of their archbishops and bishops, as far as an Act of Parliament could effect it. The excuse put forward for legislation respecting Catholic charities, that it was necessary, forsooth, to protect them from their own bishops, was now seen by the whole empire to have been nothing but a false pretence; but because Lord John Russell had written a letter to the Bishop of Durham, which it was very desirable for the noble lord should not end in mere smoke, and because the Archbishop of Canterbury had said that he did expect some legislation, and because the Bishop of London was of opinion that no ecclesiastical titles ought to be assumed by anybody or permitted to anybody except the Protestant bishops, of whom he was one, the Queen's Catholic subjects were to be vexed and harassed by new penal laws against their bishops and clergy, and the faith which was solemnly pledged to them in the year 1829 by the Crown and by Parliament, was to be deliberately and shamelessly broken. He was one of those who concurred in the opinion expressed a short time ago by Sir Edward Sugden at a county meeting, that although not so in strictness of language, in all fair and honourable understanding, the act of their emancipation must be considered as a compact between the Queen's Catholic subjects and the State. He did not agree with the notion of that very learned person, that because it pleased Parliament in that act to require from the Catholic members an oath by which they pledged themselves not to injure or weaken the Protestant religion, therefore they and their co-religionists were not, by all fair and honourable means, to promote the progress of their own; but he did agree that they ought to observe with cheerfulness and with fidelity all the conditions which were imposed upon them at the time of their emancipation. He agreed that they ought to be exceedingly careful to give no just cause of complaint or of reproach to those who, in reliance upon those conditions, mitigated or gave up the hostility which they had one time entertained to their claims. He thought that after having been now for more than twenty-two years emancipated, it was due to their Protestant fellow-countrymen to say that, until the other day, they, the Catholics of England, did enjoy, without let or hindrance, the full measure of the concessions they obtained in 1829. He was happy to express that opinion, because having been engaged during the whole of that time in the pursuit of an arduous and honourable profession, he had never known the religion which he professed to be, by any class of his fellow-citizens and countrymen in England, made to him a matter of unpleasantness, or the cause of any description of injustice. He thought that until the other day, they had had fair play in England—he said in England mind—from their Protestant fellow-countrymen. He therefore for one, and he believed everyone who heard him agreed with him, if he had thought that there was anything in the late Papal letters or in the address of his Eminence the Cardinal which had been intended to insult the majesty of the Crown of England or the feelings of their Protestant fellow-countrymen, would certainly not have signed the address congratulating the Cardinal on his appointment. But whilst he admitted in the fullest manner the claims of their Protestant fellow-countrymen to that faithful observance on their part of the conditions of their emancipation, he contended they were entitled, as British subjects, to insist upon the full measure and free enjoyment of the privileges which were then conceded to them. He said that if they permitted the provisions of the Emancipation Act to be frittered away whenever the free exercise of those privileges became distasteful to those who differed in religion from themselves, before very long they might chance to have none of them left, and that it was their duty, therefore, on the first attempt made by persons in high place to revive the old prejudices against Catholics, in order to curtail the privileges they had won after a long constitutional struggle, to oppose to that attempt a vigorous and determined resistance. The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was certainly now a very different sort of bill from that which was introduced with so much flourish, three weeks ago, by her Majesty's Attorney-General. He must do his honourable and learned friend the Attorney-General the justice to say that it did not appear, when he introduced the bill, or rather, when he stated what he supposed to be the contents of it, that he had ever read a word of it. And indeed, knowing what the most eminent judges of the equity courts in England and Ireland, and in Ireland particularly, judges the most opposed to Catholic principles and the Catholic faith, had decided in relation to Catholic charitable trusts, he could not conceive that it the honourable and learned gentleman had read the bill with his feet upon the steps that were to lend him to one of the highest seats of justice in the empire, he ever would have been a party to its introduction. In its present state, instead of being called a bill for the preventing the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles, its true description would be a bill to endeavour to degrade and humble the Archbishop of Westminster and his suffragan bishops, and also the Archbishop of Tuam. When they came to examine its provisions, they found that the effect of it would be to insult the Cardinal of Westminster and the Archbishop of Tuam, and nothing more. Speaking there as a layman, and representing as he believed the opinions of the Catholic laity

of England in that particular, he said that this bill was not the less to be resisted because it was a penal bill, affecting directly only a few individuals of their body, but that inasmuch as the persons whom they had chosen to attack were the persons in whom was represented and personified the Catholic Religion in that realm, they would be unworthy of the privileges which they enjoyed—unworthy of the name of Englishmen—unworthy of being the subjects of the Queen who reigned over them, if they did not continue to oppose this bill as manfully and as resolutely as they had done hitherto. Like all measures having for their object the perpetration of injustice, the preamble of this bill set forth a falsehood. It began by reciting a section of the 10th George IV. c. 7, sec. 24, which was commonly known under the name of the Emancipation Act, and which section, in order to gratify, and conciliate, and in some degree comfort the archbishops and bishops of the Protestant Church of these realms, imposed, as a condition upon their emancipation and that of their Irish Catholic fellow-subjects, that their bishops should not assume the titles which were by law secured to the Protestant prelates. Now it was plain to everybody that neither by the Archbishop of Westminster or any of his suffragan prelates, nor by the Archbishop of Tuam, had the title of any Protestant province or see been assumed. But it was wished, for the mortification and annoyance of those two prelates, to pass a law making them liable to a penalty of 100*l.* for assuming the titles which had been conferred upon them by a Papal Bull. They knew that the bill was to be passed by English gentlemen in both Houses of Parliament, who would not be very easily induced to break the faith which had been solemnly pledged by the Crown and Parliament of England to their Catholic fellow-subjects, and therefore they ungenerously introduced a preamble, in which they said that "it might be doubted whether the said enactment extended to the assumption of the title of archbishop or bishop of a pretended province or diocese, or archbishop or bishop of a city, place, or territory, not being the see, province, or diocese of any archbishop or bishop recognised by law." Now there was not the smallest doubt upon the subject; no lawyer in the land entertained the least doubt upon the question; it was as clear as legal language could make it. It was perfectly clear also, from the history of the Emancipation Bill, that it had never been doubted that the words of the 24th section did not extend to any thing of the kind. They might test it at once if they considered for a moment the discussions which had taken place for some years past respecting the title of Archbishop of Tuam. Had they heard anybody say that that most reverend prelate was liable, under the 24th section, to the penalty of 100*l.*? Had any one lawyer or writer upon the subject of the Papal Aggression ever dreamt of suggesting that it would be possible to sue the Archbishop of Westminster for the 100*l.* penalty provided by the 24th section of that act? No one had ventured upon such a proposition; it was a perfectly false preamble. They were ashamed to avow that the clauses of the Emancipation Act were intended to permit the constitution of the Roman Catholic Church in these realms according to its laws and customs, and accordingly they asked English gentlemen, thinking that they would not find out the pretence, to assent to the proposition that it was doubted whether the clause extended to the assumption of the titles which the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster had assumed. The rest of the preamble was equally false. It stated that the assumption of those titles was illegal. The Attorney-General and Solicitor-General had given upon this point a very cautious opinion; and could it be doubted when they remembered that Lord John Russell had assured the Bishop of Durham that he would have the law carefully looked into in order to see whether a prosecution could be instituted, and that no prosecution had been commenced, that the Government did not believe this assumption to be illegal in any sense, except the very weak sense of its being unauthorised, and that that part of the preamble was also false. It is plain from the speech of the Duke of Wellington on introducing the Catholic Relief Bill, that the assumption of those titles was not in the least degree inconsistent with what was intended to be enacted at that time. His Grace was reported to have explained in distinct terms the object of the 24th section, and that, although in his opinion it contained no real protection for the Established Church, it had been inserted in order to conciliate some persons opposed to the measure. Lord John Russell, in a speech made to the House of Commons, a few years ago, said he did not think it was of any use to prohibit, as was done by the 24th section, the assumption by Catholic prelates of the titles of the ancient sees occupied by Protestant prelates. The preamble of the bill was, therefore, to all intents and purposes, false. A great many persons, however, had endeavoured to show that, on the ground of the enactments of certain ancient statutes, the Cardinal of Westminster had incurred some legal criminality, and might be prosecuted on an indictment framed on those statutes. It had been recently declared in the House of Commons by the noble lord at the head of her Majesty's Government, by Sir James Graham, and by the law officers of the Crown, that those statutes had become obsolete, and though not actually repealed, were virtually annulled. The acts in question were passed in the reign of Elizabeth. The object of them was to establish the spiritual supremacy of the Crown of England in these realms, in opposition to the spiritual supremacy, up to that time recognised, of the Pope of Rome. In order to effect that object, it was necessary, as they thought, to insist upon an oath from all archbishops, bishops, judges, mayors, and persons receiving salaries from the Crown, that the Queen's Highness was the spiritual head of the realm of England, not only in matters temporal but in matters ecclesiastical and spiritual, and it was declared high treason for anybody to stand with, or to maintain the authority of the See of Rome, and high treason for any man to get, obtain, or to put in ure any bulls or writings of any description from the Pope of Rome; and there could not be the least doubt that, whilst those acts remained in force, if any person, having received a bull from the Pope of Rome for his consecration as an archbishop or bishop, had ventured to act upon it, as many did, he would have been liable to be found guilty of the crime of high treason, and adjudged to forfeit and to suffer accordingly. That law, no doubt, continued until the time of her Majesty's grandfather, George III.; but under his reign, first in the Irish Parliament and then in the English, acts were passed inconsistent with the provisions of the statutes of Elizabeth. By an act of the 13th and 14th George III., c. 35, entitled "An Act to enable all his Majesty's subjects or whatever persuasion to testify their allegiance to him," instead of the oath which declared that the King of England was the supreme head of the realm in matters ecclesiastical and spiritual as well as temporal, an oath was prescribed to all Roman Catholics containing a declaration that the Queen was the rightful head of the realm in all matters temporal, and that no foreign prelate, prince, state, or potentate had any temporal jurisdiction therein. The moment that act passed, and it had passed in both kingdoms when George III. had sat for eighteen years on the throne, it was perfectly absurd to contend that there was anything illegal in denying the spiritual supremacy of the Crown of England, or in doing many of those acts which had before been prohibited as inconsistent with that supremacy. This was so well understood by the statesmen of that day that Sir Burke, in a letter written by him A.D. 1795 to the late Baron Smith, expressed himself as follows: "The point is practically decided. That religion (the Catholic) is owned by the State. A great deal of the rubbish which, as a nuisance, long obstructed the way is removed. One impediment remained longer as a matter to justify the proscription of the body of our country, after the rest had been abandoned as untenable ground. But the business of the Pope, that mixed matter of politics and religion, has long ceased to be a bugbear; for some time past he has ceased to be a colourable pretext. This was well known when the Catholics of these kingdoms were for our amusement obliged on oath to disclaim him in his political capacity, which implied an allowance for them to recognise him in some sort of ecclesiastical superiority. It was a compromise of the old dispute." It was as well known then to Burke, and Pitt, and Scott, in 1781 and 1791, as in 1820 to Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, that Popish archbishops and bishops could not be without bulls from the See of Rome authorising their consecration. With this knowledge, the Legislature, by the 21st and 22nd George III. in Ireland, and by the 18th George III., c. 60, and the 31st George III., c. 32, in England, formally and distinctly recognised the existence of Popish archbishops and bishops and the exercise by them of episcopal functions. The alterations which the law of the two countries has undergone upon this point are curious and instructive. In Ireland, by an Act passed by the Irish Parliament shortly after the Revolution, 9th William III., c. 1, it was enacted that all Popish archbishops and bishops should be transported out of the realm, and that those who returned should be deemed guilty of high treason, and suffer accordingly. That the prelates thus summarily dealt with were bishops known to have been appointed and consecrated by the Pope's authority is plain, by the description "Popish" applied to them in the Act. It appears also from returns registered at the Council-office in Dublin, under an act passed in the second year of Queen Anne "For registering the Popish clergy," that they were then commonly known and designated by the titles of the ancient sees, as Dr. Oliver Pankett, Primate and Popish Archbishop of Armagh; Dr. Dominick Burke, Popish Bishop of Elphin; Dr. Mark Forstal, Popish Bishop of Kildare. The Act of William III. remained in force in Ireland from 1695 till the 21st and 22nd George III. was passed in 1781, when, after 100 years' experience, the Government of that day found that it was impossible to extirpate, no matter how great the penalties, the archbishops and bishops of

Ireland. They might take his word for it, it would be found as impossible to oppress them now. The Act of George III. took away the penalties which attached to the fact of being a Popish archbishop or bishop on condition that they should not call themselves so, provided they took an oath by which they abjured the temporal supremacy of the Pope; "provided also (sec. 8) that no benefits in that act contained should extend, or be construed to extend, to any Popish ecclesiastics who should officiate in any church or chapel with a steeple or bells, or at any funeral in any churchyard, or who should exercise the rites and ceremonies of the Popish religion, or should wear the habits of their order, save within their usual places of worship, or in a private place; or who should use any symbol or mark of ecclesiastical dignity or authority, or take any ecclesiastical rank or title whatsoever." This remained the law of Ireland until the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act, and in humble thankfulness for their lives the prelates of the Church of Ireland availed themselves of its indulgence. They then commenced the practice which they had since invariably followed, for they were faithful observers of the conditions of the compacts into which they entered, signing their Christian and surnames, with no addition but the cross, and relying upon their flocks for the recognition of the spiritual jurisdiction which the Pope's bull had conferred upon them. But though this was their status in the eye of the law, the position accorded to them by their fellow-countrymen, Protestant and Catholic, and by the Government in its intercourse with them, was far different. To deal with men of eminent piety and learning, Doctors of Divinity, and Visitors of Royal Colleges by Act of Parliament, whose rank and order as archbishops and bishops was recognised throughout the Christian world, who, during their frequent flight and exile from their own country, had been received with honour within the sanctuaries of half the cathedral churches of Europe, as if they were respected convicts or traitors on tickets of leave, was found impossible by the Fanes, the Temples, and the Fitzwilliams. In Ireland, "the body of the country," in England, the known purpose of the Minister to put an end to religious dissensions; everywhere else the blush of Christendom—was against it. It is a mistake to suppose that Lords Grey and Clarendon were the first English gentlemen in high office who recognised the ecclesiastical rank of the Roman Catholic Prelates. The address to King George III., presented on the 2nd of January, 1792, by delegates from every county in Ireland, was signed by "John Thomas Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; H. Moylan, Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork; for ourselves and the other Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland." Mr. Pitt, Mr. Dundas, Lord Thurlow, and Sir John Scott, who were then Ministers, were men who knew well what they were about; yet the petition, thus signed, was received. In England, the penalties passed against Catholic bishops soon after the revolution were less severe than in Ireland, and probably for this reason, that the Acts of Elizabeth were deemed summary enough. They made it high treason for any Roman Catholic priest to remain in England, and of course they were aware that numbers suffered under that law. The milder act, 11 and 12 William III., made Popish archbishops and bishops liable to perpetual imprisonment, and that law continued until the 18th George III., c. 60, and 31st George III., c. 32, which permitted English Catholic bishops to exercise their episcopal functions "upon conditions," the conditions being copied word for word from the Irish Act, except the one prohibiting the assumption of ecclesiastical rank or titles, which was struck out. And so the law remained until the Catholic Relief Act of 1829, which prohibited no titles but those secured by law to the prelates of the Established Church. The enacting part of the mutilated bill was a mere fraud upon the credulity of the public. It could not be carried into effect consistently with the provisions of another statute which the Government had no intention to repeal, and which a Board of Commissioners appointed by the Crown were bound to execute. Sir George Grey informed the House of Commons that he had ascertained that the bill as it originally stood would interfere with the administration of charitable bequests to Catholic priests, as it was impossible to ascertain who was the priest for whose benefits the bequest was intended, without looking at the certificate of his ordination or collation. He said he had seen one of these instruments, and that it was in Latin, and signed by Dr. Murray as Archbishop of Dublin, and he believed would not be valid without that signature. The difficulty of ascertaining who are the successors of deceased Archbishops and Bishops without looking at the Papal Bulls and noticing the titles therein set forth seemed not to have occurred to him. But it was much the more serious of the two. A few years ago an Act called the Charitable Bequests Act (7 and 8 Victoria c. 97) was introduced by the Government and passed the Legislature. It appointed a Board of Commissioners, 10 of whom were nominated by the Crown, 5 Protestants and 5 Catholics, who with three judges of the Irish Courts of Equity were to be trustees of any property which might be bequeathed or conveyed to them in trust for any Catholic archbishop or bishop exercising pastoral superintendance in any district and his successors. It would be found impossible to carry that act into operation consistently with the enacting clause of this bill. The Commissioners can't know who the successor of a Catholic bishop is without looking at the Papal Bull by which he is appointed, and in which he is described as bishop of his province or see. To save the consciences of the Protestant Commissioners who have taken the oath of supremacy, it is, indeed, provided that the duty of actually looking on and fingering the Papal Bull shall be performed by the Catholic Commissioners, but the Protestant Commissioners are on their report bound "to put it in use." Dr. Paul Cullen, who was consecrated by Cardinal Fransoni in the Pope's chapel, had no possible mode of proving that he is entitled to the benefit of the trust property vested in the Commissioners in trust for the late Archbishop Crolly and his successors—but by submitting the bull in which he is called Archbishop of Armagh to be thus examined, reported on, and "put in use." Strange and irreconcilable with the statutes of Richard the 2nd and of Elizabeth as it may appear to the students of that ancient learning, the Protestant Primate of Ireland, and the Protestant Primate of all Ireland, must, as Commissioners, should any property be bequeathed to them in trust for the new Bishop of Ross, "put in use" the bull conferring upon him that title. Complaints had been made of Dr. M'Hale for assuming the title of Archbishop of Tuam. But the Protestant province of Tuam was abolished by the 3 and 4 William IV., c. 37; and it was no more illegal for him to call himself Archbishop of Tuam than for the Archbishop of Canterbury to call himself Archbishop of Canterbury. This right was not acknowledged by law, but he was not the less the metropolitan of two millions of British subjects; and as all the other Roman Catholic Prelates had invariably signed their Christian and surnames with a cross after them, there could be no object in extending this abortion of a bill to Ireland but his mortification. They should resist any such measure. He believed Englishmen liked men to stand up manfully to assert their rights, and that they did not detest an open enemy so much as the sneaking creature who stole from the opposite camp to assist them in injustice. Let every one of the men who must ere long meet the people on the hustings understand that he would not get one Catholic vote if he supported that penal bill. He would not advise them to offer a fretful and ill-matured opposition to measures for the general benefit of the country; but when they found an unjust Government reeling on its seat, and tottering to its fall, unable to last for a day without Catholic support, let the Catholics of the empire force their representatives to seize the opportunity and compel the abandonment of any measure hostile to the principles of civil and religious liberty.

In Committee on Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill, Sir George Grey moves the insertion in the Preamble, after the word "whereas," in the first line, of the following words:—

"Divers of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects have assumed to themselves the titles of Archbishop and Bishops of a pretended province, and of pretended sees or dioceses within the United Kingdom, under colour of an alleged authority given to them for that purpose by a rescript or letter from the See of Rome, and whereas."

Also to move the following Clause:—

"This Act shall not extend or apply to the assumption or use by any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland exercising episcopal functions within some district or place in Scotland of any name, style, or title in respect of such district or place, but nothing herein contained shall be taken to give any right to any such bishop to assume or use any name, style, or title which he is not now by law entitled to assume or use."

The second and third clauses of the Bill, as printed in Series XXIII., pp. 15, 16, are withdrawn by the Government.

FINIS.



14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

4Dec'60 LF

REC'D 19

NOV 28 1960

JUL 16 1975 13

REC. CIR. JUL 14 '75

LD 21A-50m-4,'60
(A9562s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

871774

87885

p33

v.1

**

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

